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Abstract: The objective of this paper is to provide an overview and a preliminary discussion of policy and academic works addressing South-South Migration (SSM) in depth. In the first part, three development categorizations used by international agencies to estimate migration flows (provided by the World Bank, UN Population Division and the UNDP) are addressed, discussing differences in definitions, classification criteria and the resulting country groupings of the South and the North. In the second part, the most salient debates and their alleged relation to development are presented, in relation to the main features of South-South Migration so far identified by academic literature. Given that much of SSM research is expected to represent no more than an extension of former international migration research, and given the former neglect of the significance of South-South Migration, this study stresses the opportunity to rethink the relation between inequality and migration, as well as the need to rethink concepts which were developed under assumptions underlying the study of South-North Migration. It concludes that cross fertilization between approaches based on agency and structure can provide more complex and nuanced interpretations in the study of South-South Migration.
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1. INTRODUCTION

South-South Migration (SSM) is a policy and research area emerging during the last decade. Despite migration being an expression of mobility in human history, SSM has only recently been ‘discovered’. This is a major problem for the objective of undertaking a review of literature in this area. There are hundreds of academic works, theoretical and empirical, related to SSM. However, as an emerging research field, SSM is only beginning to be explored, and research on the broader phenomena, from whatever standpoint, is small.

Many academic articles and policy reports limit themselves to quote recent estimates, rather than giving thought to what they mean by SSM. Yet SSM is already a prominent issue in intergovernmental migration fora, for example in the Global Forum on Migration and Development. Few academic papers or policy reports tag their titles with a SSM reference, but increasingly SSM is being mentioned at some point in texts of varied purposes and with diverse migration subjects, with the result that the category of SSM is being taken for granted in many works.

There is also the opposite problem, that hundreds if not thousands of works are relevant to SSM research. In a way, SSM is not different from any other human movement, and many of the research interests of international migration concern developing countries and poor migrants. However, once the reasons for and the consequences of movement, their means, patterns, shapes and scales are explored, all sorts of question gain relevance, be they cultural or socioeconomic, objective or subjective. For this reason, most of the emerging SSM research extends former migration studies themes, on: types and trajectories of movements; pull and push factors; impacts and effects at destination and origin; time-space-place and movement; peoples or policies; peoples or nation states; gendered, aged and generational movements; objective and subjective mobility capacities and responses, etc. Most of these issues are ‘part and parcel’ of migration and development studies, which type of orientation is one of the biases marking this review.
I have done my search through the internet and digital academic libraries, but have not registered the trajectory of the search terms tried. Most of the websites visited are included in the annex to the annotated bibliography, and studying them was a lengthy but better search strategy than web-wide use of search terms. The ‘South South migration’ search term throws up a multitude of references in Google Scholar (1250 results). As soon as I began to check the results, I began however to wonder what SSM is about, since the works are about anything on migration. Fortunately, some repeated citations pop up as you pass through the results. Symptomatically, there is no Wikipedia page yet for “South South migration”. EBSCO Academic Search Premier provides eight results, not all worth including here. JSTOR gives 33 results, but most of them again do not merit inclusion in this review. Asia-Studies Full-Text Online gives two results. Other digital libraries were visited with similarly frustrating results.

Much of my selection of works is thus ‘opportunistic’ and relied on ‘snowballing’ through the few works that I identified as relevant in initial searches, as well as through the migration related websites. In this process, I believe that I got a sense of the meaningful emerging issues discussed for SSM as a policy and research field related to development. All of them relate to one of: 1. economic development and remittances; 2. human development; 3. (lack of) rights; 4. the nation states and migration policies, 5. the scale and patterns of migration; 6. poverty and social protection. At the same time, since I had many more works than I could discuss, I have organized the debates in two main parts. First, about what may count as SSM, which topic is a remarkable absence in the debates; and second, the contributions of the relatively few works reflecting on, or providing material for rethinking, the applicability of former migration research to the diverse Southern contexts. In this second part, many of the research gaps indicated are taken from the works and policy reports discussing SSM in depth. The discussion, however, is organized according to my own thoughts about research needs to address the importance of inequalities and transnational structures in SSM, and transnational migration in general. Thus, taking into account that most research in SSM is and will be an extension of former migration research, the question that leads this review is: what difference could the study of SSM make to former migration studies?
2. WHAT MAY COUNT AS SOUTH-SOUTH MIGRATION (SSM)

a. Development and country groupings and categorizations

SSM academic debates are very new and the question of what constitutes the South or where the South is have not yet adequately emerged. Perhaps only Bakewell (2009) has addressed this issue. This section follows his work to identify differences in the classifications of countries of the South and the North according to the three development categorizations available for quantitative studies. The categorizations come from the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs-Population Division, that we will call here UNDESA; from the World Bank (WB); and from the UNDP (United Nations Development Program). In general, this review found that SSM research takes or quotes data corresponding to one or more of these categorizations and skips discussing the implications.

In this section (2a), we will trace the lines of distinction between North and South and the emerging lines within each of them, to give an idea of the extent of divergence in the categorizations, working definitions, and resulting country groupings. Bakewell identifies three different categorizations related to SSM: 1. conventional or geographic, from UNDESA (called UN by Bakewell); 2. according to country income; and 3. according to Human Development Index (HDI, the composite index of UNDP) (2009: 2-3).

If we compare the three categorizations and working definitions, we come to different development frameworks, criteria and classifications.

Since 2008 UNDESA has been working with four development categories of countries or regions: more developed; less developed; least developed (LLD); and less developed excluding LLD (2009: vii). Bakewell (2009) comments that conventional development status and geographic regional lines are the classification criteria, but criteria of economic structures also have significant weight for the bottom categories. Criteria used to identify the least developed category (LLD) are per capita gross national income (GNI), human assets, and economic vulnerability to external shocks. The inclusion, in 2008, of the fourth category ‘less developed excluding LLD countries’ is useful for attempts to identify SSM with

---

an interest in the movements of the poorest migrants. Only amongst the bottom categories have reclassifications of countries taken place. Thus, UNDESA categorization has been particularly inadequate to treat the changes in international migration across political borders of the last 23 years.

Income categorization comes from the WB’s data on country GNI per capita and is the leading definition used in SSM research. WB (2012) provides a list of countries classified in four categories: low income; lower middle income; upper middle income; and high income. Explanatory notes mention that ‘Geographic classifications and data reported for geographic regions are for low income and middle income economies only’ and this does not necessarily imply development status (WB 2012). This may be the reason SNM/SSM research reviewed here uses OECD/non OECD membership as a subcategory of GNI (e.g. Ratha and Shaw 2007). The OECD membership criterion puts the lens closer to the richer countries, including many often considered to be of the South, while the remaining countries have been grouped together.

The HDI categorization is based in the capabilities approach that attempts to bring together issues of agency and structure. UNDP-HDI evaluates country performance on the basis of indicators of the well being of individuals in three dimensions: a long and healthy life, access to knowledge and a decent standard of living (the last includes GNI per capita). The ranges are 0–0.499 for low HDI, 0.500–0.799 for medium HDI, 0.800–0.899 for high HDI and greater than 0.900 for very high HDI (UNDP 2009: 15). The last category was added in the 2009 HDR. Although HDI provides the most nuanced categorization for SSM and SNM, it should be stressed that the 2009 HDR on migration is very skeptical of research in this direction (UNDP 2009: 21).

The addition of one more group in all leading development categorizations responds to contemporary economic and political change, of which international migration is a very pronounced part. Development

\[\text{SNM} = \text{South-North migration. As of July 2012, there is an online WB list of countries by per capita income groups: low income = $1,025 or less; lower income = $1,026-4,035; upper middle income= $4,036-12,475; high income = $12,476 or more. We do not know if this classification is new. The list of countries also provides the OECD status. Accessed 22 April 2013 <[www.ipa-online.org/pdfs/World_Bank_Country_by_Economy.pdf]>}\]
measurement is an ever debated research area. Although increasing differentiation of categories is necessary for SSM research, this will open rather than close debates, which is itself a healthy trend.

The following table attempts to locate countries in the three categorizations described here. For this purpose a North/South and a Structure/Agency axis are both used as background. On top of them, the most recent development division lines are shown in three colors, corresponding to each categorization. The horizontal length of lines shows overlaps in criteria across categorizations, and where the line is dotted it means that the corresponding criterion has less weight. The table is designed to illustrate the main differences in country groupings; it is relatively comprehensive, but gives more detail for countries of the South. Vertical text shows different location of the same country across categorizations. Where the respective pair of categories is not evident by the colors, an arrow makes it explicit.

---

5 Some of the differences were first noted by Bakewell (2009), but the table does not necessarily coincide with his appreciations because the sources consulted here are more recent, and all the agencies leading in international migration statistics are currently very active in adapting classifications.
Different classifications are found in all categories. Only the grey horizontal bars at the top and bottom contain coincident groupings. As Bakewell pointed, HDI and country income level groupings are very close for the top/Northern categories. Once UNDESA reclassifications of the former communist regions are clear, the coincidences at the top development categories will probably grow. Whether migration to rich developing countries/regions should be considered as SSM will probably be an important research issue, and it is in fact intriguing that even the thoughtful SS migration-and-development research so far produced has not given importance to this and related issues. Non purely economic issues related to power hierarchies, such as political and faith freedoms, forms of social exclusion, the acknowledgement and exercise of human and social rights, and ‘governance’ capacities of rich developing countries still justify considering them as ‘Southern countries’. However these issues entail discussing Western-centric ontological issues and their ethical implications that cannot be addressed here.
Finally, it should be noted that even if UNDESA claims that statistical convenience justifies its categories (there are extremely complex technical implications of changing them), they were created in the same post WWII period in which dependency theories emerged. To some extent, the long dated existence of specific criteria and a defined process that can ‘graduate’ countries within the bottom UN categories, contradict Bakewell’s claim that only or mainly convention characterizes the UN categorization (2009: 8-9). This does not invalidate his arguments about its political construction; but precisely in reflecting the mainstream thinking at the time of its creation, the UN categorization is relevant for research that does not detach the object of study from the context. Furthermore, the income categorization of the WB also seems to follow geographical convenience for the bottom categories (low income and lower middle income). I did not list the countries for these two categories because the WB mentions that their ranking does not necessarily reflect their development status. HDI categorization is certainly more nuanced to deal with SSM in the context of the abrupt changes in international migration of the last two decades or so (e.g. due to reconfiguration of borders). However, this does not mean that HDI is not politically constructed or that it will not face similar technical challenges to the ones already faced by UNDESA.

Finally, it should be mentioned that an important question to all the three categorizations remains in the area of transnationalism, and the space-place debates, in regard to the SS/SN migration distinction. It is hard to see how any of the categorizations can overcome criticisms raised by transnational approaches, since they measure performance as located in a geographic area. UNDP is thinking though about how to delink individual well-being improvement from geographic location:

In background research carried out for this report, we dealt with this problem by proposing an alternative measure of human development. We refer to this as the human development of peoples (as opposed to the human development of countries), as it captures the level of human development of all people born in a particular country. (UNDP 2009: 14)

This echoes Ellerman’s thoughts about the policy question of peoples or places, in which ‘policy questions might come unavoidably packaged as “place” questions as long as governments are geographically defined’ (2003: 11). It thus seems impossible and perhaps undesirable to fully leave behind geographically-bound movement views in migration research. An example is this UNDP ‘human development of peoples’ proposed measurement which could delink human development progress from destination country, but it would still tie well-being changes derived from migration to the origin country, since it would measure the gains of people with a common place of birth regardless of their current location. Despite UNDP’s apparent skepticism of SSM as a research topic, changing the focus
from the nations to the regions (and particularly to the South) may contribute to more ethically open approaches to migration and development (see Gasper and Truong 2013).

b. SSM Stocks and Gendered Stocks

The few SS international migration estimations so far produced are of very limited comparability, for the reasons discussed in the previous section. In this section, the main lines of disagreement emerging in attempts to estimate quantitatively SSM are presented. All estimates come from the few relatively comprehensive datasets available, which are collected by UNDESA, the WB and the University of Sussex. We will only consider the international migrants stocks, generally understood as the number of people born in or holding a citizenship different from the country of which they are residents (at the time of collecting data).

Before we present any numbers, a note of caution should be given. For few of the works referred to below can I can give a precise indication of the time/period of data. At some point or level, all the works below (even UNDESA) make use of the Global Migrant Database of the University of Sussex, which seems to be the best registry of bilateral movements available, and which is frequently used in combination with other data sources (see Parsons, et. al. 2005). In general, the statistics sources used are national population censuses, population registers and nationally representative household surveys. However, most publications do not clarify properly the time ranges of data.

To illustrate this, an example is useful. Ratha and Shaw present a table of the University of Sussex Database version up to 2005, in which Cameroon’s update of nationality is 1976, while Tanzania’s is 2002 (2007: 39). While the authors updated the data in all the possible ways, no time span of their effort, other than the year of their exercise, is given. Thus, in general, even if the data period used is provided, that does not mean that the data is current. Most if not all reports mention that data shortcomings are due to limited country government monitoring and registration capacities and to reporting times that vary widely across the world. Finally, it should be noted that due to lack of data availability, all estimations referred to below equate foreign birth with foreign citizenship when estimating international migrant stocks.
Since the early 2000s international governmental agencies have begun to mention SSM, but no systematic quantitative research appeared until a few years later. A report of the Global Commission on International Migration (GCIM) was the first to give an estimate of the extent of migrant stock in the South and the North (2005).\(^6\) The specific extent of the SS international migrants stock was still not worked out by the UN agency in charge of population issues (UNDESA-Population Division). The first attempt came from a recent and widely read publication of economics experts of the WB, and it built on previous work on migration and remittances. This work set the stock of SSM at 73.9 million, representing 47% of the 155.8 million estimated total international migrants in 2005, a percentage not so far from SNM (the North here including OECD and some non OECD countries) that would represent 53% or 81.9 million migrants (all percentages are rounded) (Ratha and Shaw 2007: 5; see also World Bank 2006).

Except for 2012 numbers given by UNDESA in a brief, none of its official annual migration reports reviewed here gives an explicit SS migrant stock estimation; by explicit I mean calling it SSM, and thus estimating the proportion in comparison to other movement directions (2011a; 2011b; 2009; 2005).\(^7\) At the same time, this brief is the most recent estimate of SSM stock available: 73 million in 2010, corresponding to 34% of the 2010 figure of 214 million total (known) international migrants stock; SNM is believed to be very similar: 74 million or 35% (all decimals are rounded) (UNDESA 2012). This number is not comparable to the one given before by Ratha and Shaw, not only for the reasons discussed in the previous section, but also because the period reported differs. That is one reason why very similar estimations of the stock of SSM in absolute terms (73.9 and 73 million) are at the same time the extremes of a range of 13 points difference in proportional terms (47% and 34% respectively). UNDESA’s numbers seem consistent with former projections.\(^8\)

---

\(^6\) ‘Over the past 30 years, the proportion of foreign-born residents living in developed countries has generally increased, while in most developing countries it has either remained stable or diminished to some extent. Around 60 per cent of all registered migrants are now to be found in the world’s more prosperous countries, and the other 40 per cent in developing regions. Despite this trend, large numbers of people continue to engage in “south-south” migration, moving from one developing country to another.’ (GCIM 2005: 5-6)

\(^7\) The corresponding report by UNDESA Population Division: *Trends in International Migrant Stock: Migrants by Origin and Destination* (United Nations database, POP/DB/MIG/Stock/Rev.2012) that should have more detail on the 2010 stock numbers (not estimates or projections as the former reports by UNDESA, but the updated data) has not been released as of 24 April 2013. However, it is quoted as forthcoming. Thus, the 2012 brief is the only document with data updated to 2010. An example of a report with very similar estimations, but not official, is UN-General Assembly (2012).

\(^8\) To appreciate this consistency, compare the following statements: “In the less developed regions, the migrant stock is expected to increase by 13 million (18 per cent) from 1990 to 2010.” (UNDESA 2005: 1); and “Between
On the other hand, it may be relevant to mention that UNDESA took more than five years to venture an explicit SSM/SNM stock estimate, and it was the WB publication which underpinned the sudden turn of attention to the South. Since 2007, the almost equal amounts of SSM and SNM and statements about the growing importance of SSM, have begun to crop up in the media, international migration reports and even in academia. But the numbers story is much more complex, as will be shown below.

A second most recent estimate comes from the UNDP HDR 2009: “only 37 percent of migration in the world is from developing to developed countries” (SNM), and by implication 63% is either from developed to developing countries (NSM, which is estimated below 5% in all sources reviewed here) or from developing to other developing countries (SSM) or from developed to developed countries (NNM) (2009: 2). Despite the delay of UNDP and UNDESA to give explicit SSM stock estimates, Bakewell did a quantitative comparison of the categorizations discussed in the former section, dating to 2005 reporting. His exercise also uses the Global Migrant Origin Database of the University of Sussex, and it does not provide the total number of countries included, nor the number in each category. However, differences are visible in the numbers of population provided for each development category in each categorization (see the tables in Bakewell 2009: 3). At the same time, the exercise is well designed since total international migrant stock included in each of the three categorizations is very close: 175.788 million for UNDESA development status; 174.011 for WB country income level; 175.594 for UNDP HD categorization. The summary table is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Direction of migration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S-S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Status (here UNDESA)</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income level</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP HDI</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table taken from Bakewell (2009: 3)

1990 and 2010 (...) the foreign-born population in the less developed regions increased by 13 million (18 per cent), all of whom originated in the South” (UNDESA 2012). Also notice that the SSM term is not used in the 2005 report.
Bakewell clarifies that most differences are explained by the about 30 million migrants of the former communist countries of Europe, which were then counted as more developed by UNDESA, but are not all in the top categories of the WB or UNDP.\(^9\) The estimation with UNDESA data only considers here three categories, and does not disaggregate data for the ‘less developed excluding least developed’ category added in 2008. Recently UNDESA has also been attempting to provide comparable data by undertaking major adjustments in this respect, some of which were reported in 2005 for the first time and reviewed in 2008, but which are insufficiently clear (UNDESA 2005, 2009)\(^10\).

Bakewell limits his comments in this section to state that ‘these figures suggest that the aggregate level of South-South migration outweighs South-North migration and represents the largest share of migration under income level and HDI definitions of South’ (79 million or 45% of total international migrant stock) (2009: 3, 17). This affirmation may be considered the only agreement on the scale of SSM migration, at least to the extent that SSM flows are undercounted, and Bakewell’s work is the only comparable estimate across competing categorizations. UNDESA’s detailed report of (updated 2010) SSM is not yet public.\(^11\) Furthermore, as Bakewell and other research mention, at this level of geographical scope factors other than level of development have equal or greater influence in the direction of movements, notably geographic proximity (2009: 2; also UNDP 2009: 23) and of course long established networks or other forms of ties, not to mention other social and cultural dynamics of migration.

The agreement on greater weight of SSM versus SNM does not, however, indicate that SSM is increasing with respect to SNM, and this is the main reason why UNDESA’s estimates remain valuable. Indeed an opposite trend is suggested if we follow figures indicating that between 1990 and 2010, the growth of

\(^9\) His estimate of SSM based on the UNDP-HD categorization, gives a rounded 79 million SSM stock (45%), and 74.5 million SNM stock (37%) (Bakewell 2009: 3, 10). For specific absolute numbers of the whole categorizations comparison exercise, see tables in p. 3

\(^10\) “The estimates presented in this report backdate the effect of the disintegration of the USSR to 1990 and the estimates for that date are based on the 1989 census of the USSR.” (UNDESA 2009: 1, pagenote 1). In 2005 UNDESA already had two datasets (1960-2005) and (1990-2005), with the first grouping the former USSR and and other communist countries as more developed, and the second considering the newly independent countries separately (UNDESA 2005: vii)

\(^11\) UNDESA’s brief referred above that sets SSM at 34%, a slight variation from the proportion given by Bakewell. But if we sum Bakewell’s SSM in his estimation of UNDESA’s categorization, it amounts to 57.661 millions, whereas the UNDESA brief’s absolute number estimate is 73 million (rounded), a difference of more than 15 million. We would need to know how UNDESA classified the countries of the former USSR region, only to clarify if their estimates are comparable and thus represent divergent findings, or if they are simply not comparable.
international migrant stock in the North was larger than that of the South: a 46 million increase, representing mainly movements from the South; in the South, international migrant stock would have increased by 13 million in the same period, ‘all of whom originated in the South’ (UNDESA 2012: 1, 2). Still, SSM is likely to be more temporary and thus the stocks do not necessarily reflect the extent of migration flows.

UNDESA’s historical data claims that ‘In 1960, 57 per cent of all migrants lived in the less developed regions but by 2005, just 37 per cent did so.’ Yet, historically also (1960-2005), international migration to the North and to the South seems relatively stable if the consequences of former European communist regions are discounted (UNDESA 2005: Fig. 1 and p. 2). These long term trends are still unclear. In any case, below this apparent stability, a regional dynamism in migration across developing countries has persisted, with continued movements to some countries that emerged as destinations in the 1970s and 1980s, increasing movement across regions, and intermittent conflict induced movements, some of them part of declines of immigration in other developing countries during the 1990s (UNDESA 2004: 26). General statements about a new significance of SSM migration or about a recent change in trends should be handled carefully, and it must be remembered that all the estimates have large margins of possible error.

We have only dealt with the quantitative estimations of the first line of distinction between North and South, with divergences stemming mainly from what counts as movements to the North and to the South. Similarly, it is not possible to deal with undocumented or unregistered migration. UNDP reported that irregular migration could involve 50 million migrants in the world (2009: 2). But since all authors reviewed here agree that the great majority of southern countries have weak capacities of border control and of movements registration, it is most probable that SSM is and has been much higher than the estimates reviewed here, which are largely sourced by official national accounts.12 There is one interesting (non statistical) estimation attempt of bilateral SS cross-border unregistered movements in the Saharan region (Brachet 2012).

---

12 For example, talking about SS ‘labor migration’ IOM comments: ‘Although the evidence surrounding South–South migration remains anecdotal, much of it is irregular, thus posing a challenge for governments and heightening the vulnerability of migrant workers who are subjected to exploitation.’ (2011: 49).
c. Women in international migrant stocks of developed and developing countries

So far, there are no global estimations of the share of women in SSM in comparison to other movement directions. However, there are some significant remarks available. First, all sources agree that the share of women among international migrants is currently almost half: 48% in 2005 (UNDP HDR 2009: 25); 49.2% in 2005 (UNDESA 2009: 6), 49% in 2000 (WB 2006: 28). Since the majority of migrants has since the 1950s moved from the South, these numbers can be taken as a general reference of the weight of women in migration to North and South countries. The following table presents the numbers available, noting that not even in the aggregated developed/developing categories are the same countries contained in the different estimates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Share of Women in the International Migrant Stock by Development Categorizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income categorization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data taken from Ratha and Shaw (2007: 21) for income categorization; from UNDESA (2011a: table 8), which does not provide absolute numbers.
* represents millions

The differences stem from the criteria for country development classifications and I cannot comment now on the visible differences in the table. The only valuable observation I can make is that as general development classifications are disaggregated, differences in women’s share in the migrant stock become more noticeable, either across the disaggregated categories for income (OECD/non OECD), or across the disaggregated UN categories (developing and least developed). This is one way to appreciate the importance of availability of a greater number of categories, and possibly also, of organizing data to be suitable for less rigid comparisons in terms of country development over time. On the other hand, it should be noticed that UNDESA claims that since 2000 both regions have shown a declining trend in the proportion of women in international migrant stocks (UNDESA 2009: 5).

---

13 UNDESA 2005 revision provided gender data for the first time, and made estimates for nearly all world countries despite lacking migration data for 9 countries; similarly it made gender estimations for 202 countries, despite incomplete or absence of data for the great majority of countries. Since the 2010 revision brings the countries included down to 196, it is possible that some of the modeling and extrapolations to estimate migrant stocks have been dropped.
Because of gendered roles and subjectivities, ‘female’/’male’ migration is deeply associated to life course. UNDESA gives some estimations of age composition of international women migrant stocks, which would be similar in the youngest age groups (until 20 years old) for developed and developing countries. However, starting in the 20-24 age cohort women migrants drop significantly in the share of migrant stock of developing countries, compared to developed countries; whereas in the five cohorts for 30 to 49, there are around 70 women per 100 men, compared to a very close proportion of both genders for developed countries; in the older age cohorts, migrant women growth rates raise in both regions, though they raise faster in developing than in developed countries (UNDESA 2011b: 3-4).

Finally, a few comments about women migration trends of longer duration may be useful to contextualize current data. According to UNDP, numerical gender balance was reached long ago. The aggregate women’s share in international migrant stocks seems stable over the past five decades (e.g. 47% in 1960) (UNDP 2009: 25; WB 2006: 27, 28). The only significant contrast at this point may be with respect to the XIX century when men are believed to have dominated international migration (UNDP 2009: 25). But, just like international migrant stocks, women’s share hides important differences over time.

To sum up, so far explicit quantitative estimations of SSM stock are few and only one (Bakewell 2009) is comparable across divergent categorizations. Bakewell’s findings about the convergence of estimates based on the UNDP-HDI and WB country income categorizations, and about SSM outnumbering SNM, does not mean (he himself mentions) that the first has necessarily grown faster; the reverse seems to be the case, at least to the extent that large but unknown amounts of undocumented or unregistered migration are not considered in the official figures. It should be noticed also that there are many other factors affecting international movement, notably geographic proximity and the roles of networks, gender and age hierarchies across places, which will be discussed below.

If the estimations and patterns as discussed here are correct, it is accurate to say that SSM is a newly recognized phenomenon. At the same time, if women’s participation in migration is considered, then qualitative differences in international migration become visible, even in the numbers. An important research question would thus be why it took so long to realize that SSM is and has been extremely significant, and what are the reasons for the recent commotion caused by SSM’s possibly mistakenly stated recent changes (e.g. Margolis 2006, quoted in Ratha and Shaw 2007).
3. SOUTH-SOUTH MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT

a. Competing Views

The study of international migration is rooted in broader paradigms of the human and social sciences (De Haas 2009). For this reason, just as there are different development approaches to estimating migration movements, there are also competing views of migration:

Broadly, different conceptualizations of migration may be differentiated as follows: 1) migration as an integral aspect of macro-changes (socio-demographic, economic, cultural, and political) in the *longue durée* ...; 2) migration as a time- and space-bound phenomenon patterned by interactions between migration-related institutions and collective actors (household, labour markets, recruitment and employment agencies, migrants’ organizations) ...; 3) migration policy and practices as bounded by the ethos of nation-states, public opinion, and the politics of migrants’ rights and identities... (Truong et. al. 2013: 5).

These conceptualizations of migration are inevitably enmeshed in development conceptualizations (of which the first part of this review gave a very partial sample). In the following review of the relevant academic works addressing SSM in depth, these different conceptualizations will be apparent in most works, and sometimes overlapping within them. However, the organization of emerging SSM debates given below aims to show the need to openly incorporate in the discussions the causes of persisting inequalities, that seem to emerge in many works but never fully do. This elusiveness has to do with numerous ethical dilemmas in the art of government and of creating knowledge, with a more or less general lack of willingness to communicate across research locations, and of course with vested powerful interests.

Within the much studied migration-development nexus, towards the end of the XX century, two contrasting types of views of international migration were well established: structuralist views informed by developmentalist modernization theories, in its classical economics or Marxist currents; and the new agency-inclined views that challenge the determinism of the modernization paradigm, and attempt to bring hope, also after the traumatic Marxism-inspired experiences of the XX century. De Haas provides an insightful historical discussion of international migration related to these views, and their current
relevance to SSM research. In his introduction, he states: ‘The shift from more pessimistic to optimistic views has concurred with a similar shift in social scientific and development policy paradigms from structuralist and dependency perspectives to functionalist, agency-oriented and neoliberal views emphasizing the efficiency of (free) markets and the capacities of individuals to improve their own lives and bring about structural changes’ (2010: 1).

The principled distinction between ‘social scientific’ and ‘development policy’ paradigms reflects the research and ethical dilemmas and challenges mentioned above. Despite the usefulness of De Haas’ distinction, persistent avoidance of openly incorporating ethical and principled issues in one’s work has contributed to the contemporary exacerbation of world inequalities, and will continue to do so. Thus, most of the dominant views of migration and development will optimistically continue to ignore the scientifically informed findings about functions of inequalities in migration. This will be illustrated below.

b. SSM and SNM

SSM is believed to involve around 73 million or 34% of the 215 million international migrants in 2010 (UNDESA 2012). Ratha and Shaw (2007: 17-18) recall that country income differences influence SSM, while Bakewell notices that countries classified as having high HDI have ‘the highest number of migrants per head (65 per thousand) compared to low, very low, and even very high HDI countries’ (2009: 19).

The most important and widely shared implication of bringing out these findings is that they have helped ‘to dispel the myth that international migration occurs mainly from poor developing countries to rich countries in the North’ (Wickramasekara 2011:79) and thus to put into perspective the fears of Northern countries about migration inflows from the South.

Whether the unknown amounts and/or the frequency of remittances sent by millions of SS migrants can foster economic development is and will be a hotly debated issue. So far, few SSM remittances estimates have been produced. Ratha and Shaw calculated that remittances from migrants living in countries of the South could range from 9% to 29% of the total amount received by developing countries in 2005 (between $18 billion and $55 billion out of total SS remittances of $188 billion)\(^{14}\).

\(^{14}\) The high range point divides the total remittances by the number of migrants, assuming that all migrants send remittances and that all send the same amount, and thus dismissing income levels of destination countries. The low range point adjusts remittances to the per capita income level of the destination countries, but still assumes that all migrants send the same fraction of income (2007: 10-12).
However these and a third estimation provided by the authors assume that all migrants have income and all can and are willing to remit money. At a case study level, other SSM research already has found evidence contradicting this assumption (Lee 2010 for Nicaragua; Mechlinksi 2010 for Burkina Faso).

Many of the questions about the potential of SSM to contribute to development revolve around the implications of the fact that remittances from moving to a Southern country are generally less than from moving to a Northern country (e.g. Hujo and Piper 2007; De Haas 2010). This seems to be the case with respect to country income. In 2009, it was estimated that remittances received by developing countries added up to $307 billion dollars out of a world total of $416 billion; however only $22 billion would have reached low income countries, compared to $285 billion that would have gone to middle income countries (Mohapatra et. al. 2010). Similarly, UNDP reported that only 1% of estimated remittances reached low HDI countries in 2007 (2009: 78).

Thus the overall benefit of SSM seems to be less than that of SNM, but within SSM the distribution of remittances between countries is highly unequal. Because the difficulties and costs of remitting money are generally high, and possibly higher in the south, important amounts of remittances are sent through informal channels; along with the unknown extent of irregular migrants, this entails that the aggregate remittances could be higher than estimated (see De Haas 2010; Ratha and Shaw 2007). In the near future, we will probably see enormous money investments and efforts to estimate SSM remittances through informal channels.

Remittances estimates are consistent with the scale of emigration being greater for middle than for low and highest income countries (Bakewell 2009) and also with the observations that people from low income countries tend to move to neighboring countries that have only small income differences from their own country. According to Ratha and Shaw, of 167.6 world million migrants in 2005, 16.2 million would have moved from low income countries to other low income countries, while 7.9 million would have moved from low income to middle income countries by 2005 (2007: 18). Bakewell also states that that SSM ‘is the most prevalent form of migration occurring from the countries with the lowest HDI’ (2009: 11).

c. Migration Policies and Inequality
Perhaps the most mentioned feature of SSM is the increasing and changing diversification of flows. This issue is discussed in some of the works reviewed here and it is linked to increasing pressures to manage migration inflows from the South by the contemporary North (Hujo and Piper 2010, Meyer 2008). Diversification is so significant that it is penetrating former types of SSM. Bakewell concludes that there is evidence of increasing inter-linkages between migration flows of refugees and labor migrants in continental migration poles, as well as in migration systems that link Africa to Europe, the Gulf and North America. This ‘mixed migration’ phenomenon not only refers to asylum seekers moving through labor migrant irregular channels, but also to labour migrants deported and placed ‘in situations akin to that of refugees’ (2009: 30).

There are also related insights about the multilateralisation of skilled human flows in SSM, referring also to the diversification of their destinations (Meyer 2008). Such changes are linked to selective immigration policies of the North (Meyer 2008) and increasingly also of developing South countries, which however have less capacities of border control. These policies are now beginning to appear not as natural as presented in traditional economic migration studies.

On the other hand, multilateralisation of skilled and unskilled migration and diversification of migration flows are also related to increasing inequalities resulting from the selectivity of migration policies and their possible extension to rich Southern countries. In the South, among the diverse migration patterns there are currently several forms of temporary-contract migration, often referred to as circular migration. Such circularity resembles former Northern forms of labor migration management, such as the Bracero Program of the USA and ‘guest’ worker schemes of European countries. Current policy and economically induced changes add pressures to the livelihoods conditions of people in the poorest countries. The logic of the mix of restrictive and selective immigration policies is well summarized in the following lines:

1. Drawing on high-skilled workers from poorer countries; 2. Making use of but socially excluding low-cost lesser-skilled foreign labour, in those labour-intensive tasks which cannot be relocated to low-wage countries, notably many tasks in agriculture, construction, personal services and care sectors—some in legally approved temporary arrangements and some in formally irregular but tolerated shadow zones; and 3. Marginalizing and excluding other groups, both within and without a country, as part of the ideological legitimation of rule by a national elite. (Gasper and Truong 2013: 376)
The last point in this quote is part of the growing criticisms of nation states’ refusal to accept mobility as an feature of human history, while at the same time promoting liberalization policies for greater globalization. Wickramasekara notices that international migration is estimated to have represented around 3% of world population for the last half century, before putting the right question: why do so few people migrate across borders? The answer is simple: besides sacrifices involved, ‘more nation states in the world (now about 200) means more barriers to movements’ (2011: 79). This author also notes that the HDR by UNDP (2009) reports that in a sample of countries analyzed, that 38% of developing and 50% of developed countries were closed to the permanent migration of low skilled workers’ (2011: 85).

On the other hand, it has also been suggested that at a regional level, the South has relatively less restrictive contexts for the free mobility of people, compared to the North. One reason is their weak border enforcement capacities, coupled with the very complex histories of nation-building in the South (for example, see Sikander Mehdi 2010 about irregular migration across Bangladesh and Pakistan; Sebba 2007 about historical links between South Sudan and Uganda; and Howard 2007 for the Dominican Republic and Haiti). The other reason would be the regional integration projects-agreements involving measures of free intraregional movements of people, which are however weakly enforced. The integration agreements referred to are the Caribbean Community (CARICOM), the Mercado Común del Sur (MERCOSUR/ Southern Common Market), the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), the Southern African Development Community (SADC), the East African Community (EAC), the Common Market for East and Southern Africa (COMESA), and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) (Hujo and Piper 2010: 15). (For Africa agreements see Adepoju (2001); for MERCOSUR see Cerruti (2009).) This is a very active area of SSM research, often linked to the relations between trade and migration.

Barriers to mobility have their counterpart in the absence of an international governance regime in the area of migration, an issue that has been much researched before, but that will need revisiting after SSM features and forces behind it are better understood. Wickramasekara (2011) proposes a group of issues that should be addressed in view of the emergence of a global labour market, including lifting the barriers to rights, protection, and mobility of migrants, and of unskilled workers in particular. An emerging issue is the incipient or non regulation by Southern governments of the commercialization of mobility, particularly with respect to the private recruitment industry that benefits from the barriers to
mobility (Wickramasekara 2009; Meyer, 2008). Limited implementation of migration policies has also been mentioned as a problem to mobility in Southern countries that have adopted comprehensive migratory reforms, like Argentina, Dominican Republic, Indonesia and Morocco (Ratha and Shaw 2007: footnote 28) including the regulation of entry, regularization options and due process, as well as migrants’ protection. However, comprehensiveness does not necessarily entail reduced barriers to mobility and it is in fact likely that the broader the scope of immigration policies, the more obstructive they become, as long as national citizenship/no citizenship provisions are included.

Most SSM research and international migration policy reports agree on the need to reduce movement barriers, but the differentiations between skilled and unskilled migrants in country regimes and bilateral and regional agreements, and the lack of enforcement of international commitments related to migrant workers’ rights, imply a need for research on the relations between migration and the large scale reproduction of inequalities. For example, Crush and Ramachandran (2009) argue that growing xenophobia responds to broader changes in political, social, and economic structures:- political and economic integration of countries; the ‘securitization’ of migration after 9/11; structural transformation in industrial societies and consequent increasing exclusion and marginalization of some people; and racialized and nationalist media representations. Their paper argues for commitment to normative international standards, discusses the urgency to address growing world xenophobic attitudes, and calls for a coordinated international response to increasing xenophobia in the South too. It also calls for monitoring, measurement and general research on citizen attitudes to migrants, refugees and migration policy, particularly in the South.

All mobility barriers produce high-risk irregular movements and have enormous negative consequences in terms of legal liminality situations in which migrants in the South and in the North often find themselves (Menjivar and Coutin 2013). This problem is directing SSM research to the area of social protection of migrants, and ultimately leads discussions to the contradictions involved in addressing ‘movement of people across borders separately from the ways in which societies define their social contracts and insert themselves into the global market economy’ (Hujo and Piper 2007: 5; also Gasper and Truong 2013). The links between citizenship and social policy are identified by De Haan and Yaqub as a double-edged sword because governmental forms of protection inevitably entail forms of exclusion (2010). ILO is the leading intergovernmental agency promoting social protection of migrants and has produced important research in this area.
4. MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT: THE MACRO AND THE MICRO LEVELS

Borrowing on the structure of one of De Haas’s works (2009) I begin by outlining the main mechanisms by which international migration is believed to affect economic and human development: allegedly macroeconomic effects of remittances; productive investments by diasporas at a local or community level; and productive investments in education, health and other indispensable expenses of the members of the migrant’s household. These and related arguments are beginning to be discussed with respect to SSM and are always present in the reports and discourses of international governmental organizations active in the field of international migration: IOM, the Global Migration Group, the World Bank, the International Forum on Migration and Development, and UN agencies such as UNDP, ILO and UN Women. Academic research has also largely discussed along these lines the potential impact of migration, and now SSM in particular, on country development.

a. Remittances

Despite the enormous interest in SSM as a development trigger, De Haas recalls that the New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM) has shown that economic development of an area depends on the local economic environment rather than on migration benefits alone; he further argues against putting the responsibility of development on the shoulders of migrants (2010). Remittances sent and their effects depend on many social, cultural and economic forces, as well as on the migrant’s subjectivities and willingness to send money. Former international migration studies have shown that migrants’ incomes are as diverse as the income of the non migrant host population, due to jobs availability and to migration conditions (see De Haan and Yaqub 2010: 7). Thus, the causes and consequences of remittances for the lives of migrants and for transnational households, their scale, their uses by different groups of migrants and receivers and for SSM countries and areas, as well as the changes related to them, will be another important group of research issues regarding SSM.

b. Who Moves and Under What Conditions

A related research area concerning SSM, is who moves and under what conditions. Although SSM research on migrants’ characteristics is scarce, several authors have noticed that SSM significantly involves the movement of the people with less skill or less educated, compared to SNM (e.g. Hujo and Piper 2007, among others). This relates to the fact that overall SSM includes most of the movement of
the poor, in contrast to SNM. For instance, while discussing the livelihoods approach to reduce poverty and insecurity of households, Ellis called migration to adjacent countries ‘south south migration’, a phenomenon related to the lower costs of movement and to reduced distance, and/or to the emergence of networks that reduce risks and costs of movement (2003: 5; see also De Haas 2010).

Ellis also differentiated this type of movement from conflict induced movement and from environmental related seasonal movement, which overlap though with SSM. Although SSM is not limited to movements between neighboring countries, the insight is useful in representing movements for improved livelihoods that have a recent necessity dimension motivated by economic survival or by a change in living aspirations (the last in the post-structuralist sense of Gardiner 2004). Both dimensions in a movement are important to understand the interactions and intersections between (a) livelihood-related freedom issues, and (b) other cultural and social freedoms, such as freedom from inherited gender or age hierarchies, ‘rites of passage’, being subjectively mobile, or other social constructions like ‘being modern’. And in this sense, both dimensions relate to the push side of migration, as much as to the pull side, which is more frequently underlined in migration discussions. This imbalance contributes to the neglect of work on inequalities and migration.

c. Selectivity and Inequality

Several authors argue that SSM can be at least as beneficial as SNM for reasons related to inequality. De Haas stresses the reduced selectivity of SSM, the fact that among potential migrants, the movement of the best able and/or best skilled and/or best networked or best resourced is less pronounced and thus more redistributive: ‘Because South-South or internal migration is often less selective than the more costly and risky South-North migration, the effect of the latter form of migration is more likely to be inequality-increasing’ (2009: 26). De Haan and Yaqub hold that ‘the poorest migrate often as an extreme survival strategy, suggesting that when they migrate, this is likely to be less beneficial than the migration by the better off’ (2010: 7). Apart from these insights, the works by De Haas (2009) and De Haan and Yaqub (2010), Bakewell (2009) as well as Hujo and Piper (2010) acknowledge the context dependence of migration decisions and outcomes, and thus the consequent diversity of migration experiences with respect to household development.

15 This SSM movement, movement to adjacent countries, is separated from displacement due to ethnic conflict and war (refugees and asylum seekers), movement to industrialised countries (south-north migration), and seasonal, circular, or longer duration sub-types in the preceding cross-border or international movements (Ellis 2003: 4-5)
Generalization is unwarranted, not only because inequalities-effects change with the emergence of networks, but primarily because their effects are entangled in the specific (poverty) circumstances that motivated the initial decision to migrate (De Haas 2010; De Haan and Yaqub 2010). A research/methodology gap mentioned is that movements of the poor are not well captured by surveys or quantitative methods. These issues concern SSM but also internal migration, and stem from considering migrants as a category of individuals in instrumentalist and rationalist framings that ignore non-economic dimensions, and that assume a reduced propensity to move by the poor, with the result that the movements of the poor are often not studied and thus ignored. As the authors making this point summarize it, ‘relatively little of the evidence is sufficiently poor-specific’ (De Haan and Yaqub 2010: specially 4-6). This does not necessarily mean that meaningful knowledge is unavailable, but rather that few works have specified the link between poverty and SSM.

If SSM is the main, if not the only, direction of movement in which the very poor engage, and these movements of the very poor tend to be the most redistributive among all movement directions, but at the same time they involve the least number of international migrants compared to SNM, and of remittances from international migration in general, it may not make sense that the potential of SSM for country development would be the leading debate, rather than the connections between inequality and SSM/SNM and within these broad categories. Dimensions of the functions and forms of migration in the reproduction of inequalities for economic development of countries and regions will hopefully gain recognition as a research area regarding SSM. While discussing the relevance to SSM of border migration for harvest work, ethnic migration within ancestral territories divided by borders, and migration to cities for professional and care work, respectively, Hugo and Piper state:

More research that provides this type of comparative data is needed in order to deepen our understanding of South–South migration, especially with regard to direction of migration (rural–rural, rural–urban, urban–rural, and between and within labour market sectors), composition (men, women, families, and ethnic minorities) and duration (seasonal, circular and permanent). (2010: 11-12)

At the micro-level, most works take a positive view regarding the SSM potential to promote development from a livelihoods perspective. This is the general stand of the UNDP Human Development Report (2009). Part of the remittances benefit has to do with resilience of this type of income in times of
instability or recession (De Haas, 2010; Mohapatra et. al. 2010). Through reviews of literature on remittances, De Haas argues that however small in relative terms, migration can improve the livelihoods of poor households in origin areas (2009). He clarifies that this only refers to the fact that when people’s security of livelihoods is threatened, any improvement is positive. These types of often forgotten thoughts do not permit a belief in SSM as the solution for the survival of the poorest, but point rather to more enquiries about the causes of survival-threats that underpin the movements. For example, Hujo and Piper are among the few that explicitly acknowledge volatility of incomes and their general low levels as a cause of movement (on the push side) (2010: 3). On the other hand, De Haas suggests possible links between SSM (and internal migration) with rural and agricultural stagnation or decline (2009: 28). It is here where the classification by Ellis (2003) may help to distinguish environmental seasonal migration that has been present throughout history, from contemporary economic threats to livelihoods.

d. Youth and Children

Although diversity of contexts and experiences of migrants makes well-being findings less conclusive at this micro level, there are other useful insights in the area of who moves within SSM. According to McKenzie, young people aged 12-24 on average account for one-third of the flow and one-quarter of the stock of international migrants, but the share of youth in these flows, and of youth moving independently, would be greater for SSM than SNM (2008). On the other hand, while discussing the diversity of movement experiences of the poor, De Haan and Yaqub mention that these movements may involve the most vulnerable members of the household, referring to children and youth, though children are a neglected research area in international migration, since children’s migration has been largely framed in terms of gender (2010: 12). Kofman and Raghuram also mention that migrant child workers have generally played a leading role in delivering domestic work as well as care of the elderly in the South (2009: 11). In the introduction to the book where that chapter is contained, Hujo and Piper link demographic change to youth movements in the South. Underlying these patterns, restrictive immigration policies in rich Northern countries contribute to the more general diversification of migration destinations across the more porous South (2010: 9; Meyer 2008: 5).

e. Women migrants

Rather than showing particular movement-direction trends, the growth of women migrants seems present in most if not all migrant streams, as a result of more male unemployment or underemployment
pushing women to enter the paid labor markets (this is a conclusive gender studies research finding, but in terms of SSM see for example Hugo and Piper 2010: 9). The patterns of women’s migration are insufficiently explored in the South, where, however, similar trends to those of SNM are already noticed as well as heterogeneities:

Large scale migration for care purposes characterizes South to North (OECD and non–OECD countries such as Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (SAR), Saudi Arabia, Singapore and the United Arab Emirates/UAE) flows, and from low- to middle-income Southern countries within a region, for example to Argentina, Chile, Costa Rica, Jordan, Malaysia, the Russian Federation, Venezuela and parts of Eastern Europe. There are also marked internal variations within countries of the global South as well as between them. Yet, these differences are often elided in current analyses. (Kofman and Raghu Ram 2010: 10)

This kind of research extension to gendered SSM would help to understand the observations by Ratha and Shaw related to the diversity of gendered migrations along SS corridors to middle income countries (2007: 28). But diversity in occupations and spatial distributions of women international migrants should not only be studied with respect to changes in gendered labor demands, but also in respect of poverty in origin areas and its effects along life course changes. In fact, there might be unspecified links between SSM and SNM patterns of gendered labor demands by country income levels. This catches the eye if judging from the share of women in international migration stocks: a notably low number of women migrants are believed to be in the high income not OECD countries (rich developing countries) (8.7 million) compared to 46.2 million in high income OECD countries, and 38.9 million in developing countries (Ratha and Shaw 2007: 28).

Since in SNM the dominating trends have been gendered labor demands for care work in the North (on the pull side), while simultaneously there have been diverse and less selective SSM and internal migrations in the South (on the push side), then the relevant research area is how both patterns connect to demographic pressures and life courses in the South and the North. Globally, discussing migration involves discussing the distributions of ‘excess’ or ‘surplus’ labor. According to Hugo and Piper, SSM is also characterized by concentration of movement in ‘the most productive’ working age groups (2010: 11), which include the reproduction and childcare ages. UNDESA, on the other hand, reports that in 2010 women migrants clearly outnumbered men migrants in Europe and Oceania, whereas men outnumbered women migrants in Africa and Asia. (‘Migrants’ here means international migrants.) In Latin America and the Caribbean, women were about to reach the same proportion as men in the same
year whereas women slightly outnumbered men migrants in North America (2011a: 6). A final UNDESA data trend is the decline in women's share in recorded international migrant stock since 2000 (2011a: 5); this is not incompatible with increased gendered movements in *irregular* migration resulting from restrictive migration policies.

Thus, interactions linking the (widely studied) care labor demand of the rich North, perhaps also selective of young women (as daughters or as young mothers), with patterns of less selective movements, youth and perhaps children across the South as discussed above are possibly current. If these patterns were connected, it should be further asked how and to what extent/scale they could be transformed in middle income countries with rising care labor shortages, for example in nursing (Kofman and Raghuram 2010: 7, 9), and where opportunities in the economy may still be different than in the contemporary historical North. Along with gendered roles and subjectivities, that analysis would help to unpack the diversity of occupations of women in SSM, the concentration of young women in particular occupations (McKenzie 2008), mobility patterns by poverty levels, and to relate all this to demographic pressures, and to youth and children livelihood prospects linked to movement, objectively and subjectively. It should be recalled that the movement of single women is a characteristic shared between contemporary migrations and XIX century migrations (Rakkee and Sasikumar 2012: 2).

f. Care Intersectionalities and Social Reproduction

Although patterns of movement within the South are still unspecified on a reliable basis, some countries appear to have been attracting significant migration from other developing countries. ‘The major middle-income migration poles are Argentina and Venezuela in South America, Jordan in the Middle East, Malaysia and Thailand in Asia, the Russian Federation, and parts of Eastern Europe, such as Poland’ (Kofman and Raghuram 2012: 5). Previous neglect of SSM as a research area has meant that the dynamics involving migration regimes, care regimes, migration chains, and their social reproduction dimensions in the South are unknown.

Kofman and Raghuram find that middle income countries are tied to global circuits in distinctive ways and that studying care chains in the South poses new questions regarding geographical interactions within the South (2012). The fact that the concept of *global care chains* was developed on the basis of empirical studies about SNM, has meant that issues for the more heterogeneous situations in the South may not be well explained by the idea of the transfer of costs downwards, particularly if heterogeneous
familial situations and complex care arrangements are considered (Ibidem; see also Uptown 2011 on Africa care arrangements and outcomes related to migration). Neither the significance of shorter distance movements on health care arrangements, nor the social outcomes of exchanges across the care and non care economy, or across occupations, have been sufficiently studied; thus, the mix of migrants and non migrants in the provision of care remains unexplained (Ibidem). Since the very significant internal movements in the South, the spatial circuits of care chains, as well as the role of care in the life cycle, could sometimes be different from what has been theorized so far, Kofman and Raghuram argue that the underlying ‘lynchpin’ notion of class ‘needs to be contextualized and understood intersectionally with other axes of difference such as race, caste, and ethnicity’ (2012: 12).

All these possible consequences of bringing SSM under the lens of gender studies call for a rethinking of how gendered structures interact with institutions that were constructed under notions that may be alien in some of the diverse histories of the South, such as public/private, or the state and impersonal law. The growing literature on the intersection of vulnerabilities in the experiences of women pulled into care and non care responsibilities and simultaneously dealing with ambiguities created by the neglect of the roles of women in social reproduction (see Irianto and Truong 2013; Kusakabe and Pearson 2013; Truong, T.D., M.L. Marin, and A. Quesada-Bondad 2013; Kabeer 2007; Lawson 1998) may benefit from attempting to disentangle forms of difference common to the West from those common to the South, and from further exploring the diversity within the South.

5. MIGRATION AND DEVELOPMENT: THE MESO LEVEL

In the previous section, absences of research on inequality, due to the concern with migration as a development strategy, were discussed for the emerging research on SSM migrations at the micro level and in terms of what this may tell us about macro level inequalities. We still have to look at the research avenues and research absences at the meso level, which focuses on local development and thus looks at the interactions of households and individuals with their immediate socioeconomic and cultural environments.

a. Transnationalism and Brain Drain/Gain
International migration research has largely dealt with these connections through the diverging debates on transnationalism and ‘brain drain/gain’. The main difference between these two sets of approaches is that the second is bound to nation-state sedentary notions of belonging and movement, while transnationalism attempts to overcome and problematize the issue of time-space-place in international migration (see Truong et. al. 2013). Similarly, brain drain/gain looks at the economic impact of movements, while transnationalism has focused more on cultural and social impacts of migration.

Hugo and Piper argue that the study of SSM must begin by reviewing the applicability of both these central concepts, since they are part of the North-South bias of international migration research (2007: 3). The idea of ‘brain’, more generally referring to talent, stems from the study of international migration’s (non natural) selectivity towards the more skilled or more educated (De Haas 2010). But if SSM very largely involves the movements of the less skilled and less educated, it is reasonable to question the idea’s relevance. Hugo and Piper do a similar critique for transnationalism. SSM seems to rely far more than SNM on temporary and contract work, and thus would involve only ‘a small number of “elite” migrants moving across continents where longer-term migration, and even settlement, is an option’ (Hujo and Piper 2007: 3).

The ‘drain’ metaphor in migration selectivity had also been applied in rural migration studies, referring to the out-movement of the physically able. This extension of attention contradicts the elite-drain claim in transnationalism studies, but there is a risk of reincorporating a gender bias that ignores the movement of women for ‘dangerous, dirty, difficult’ (3D) work (Hujo and Piper 2010: 30) of the sorts well-recognised in relation to men’s SNM. In many countries of the South, women are increasingly participating in work traditionally considered as for men. However, given the apparent prominence of care labor demand in middle income countries, SSM research involving women in paid work outside the care economy and manufacturing exports, or outside petty trade, is extremely hard to find. This could be the result of global structures of gendered labor demand and poverty, and/or of a research focus on women’s entrance to paid work through the care economy and global production chains, which might neglect other forms of labor movements of women in the very diverse South.

Durmont et. al. (2010) is an example of a simple extension of former SNM debates to SSM. In this econometric study of bilateral migration comparing OECD and non OECD countries, the authors conclude that distance between origin and destination would have a negative impact on skilled
emigration rates, but migration selectivity would remain positive: thus, less skilled people would move less than the skilled, but people would continue to move at all skills levels. A review of literature on human resources flows, with the objective to reflect on SSM, also confirms that most of the former SNM debates will continue along similar lines for SSM. In this review, Meyer recalls that ‘A circulation paradigm has emerged and the notion of brain gain has come to the forefront in the 1990s with basically two options: return or diaspora’ (Meyer 2008: 2); both alternatives have been criticized in terms of the need for conditions of economic growth to make return possible, and of the magnitude of diasporic contributions, as well as their sustainability (Ibidem).

In fact, the negative effects of human resources depletion seem to be reinforced in SSM, and are particularly salient in some very small, least developed and/or small island countries; in contrast they may turn into gains for big developing middle income countries like Brazil, India or China, which are however exceptional cases (Meyer, 2008). Meyer supports the idea of a possibly increasing multilateralisation (or diversification) of human resource flows in SSM, despite the historical SNM selectivity associated with the concentration of education, technological and scientific capacities in the North, and which seems very pronounced for professional women. He provides an image of what such circulation of skilled resources may look like:

a waterfall effect with outflows of human resources moving downstream from the less developed, to the developing, to the middle income countries. Vacant positions resulting from migration are filled by new inflows except for those less developed countries at the high end of the waterfall. Therefore, the international circulation of skilled people has different impacts according to the position of source and receiving countries. Compensation effects may happen for some but those at the bottom do not benefit from them (Ibidem: 12)

As in previous discussions of brain drain, significant rural-urban or international emigration of professionals in the health sector could affect service capacity in origin areas, but this could be part of a more general staff crisis (Ibidem.). Although at the aggregate/international level the effects in health systems capacities seem insignificant, at the country or local level the impacts can be very drastic for the not benefited countries (Ibidem). Regarding the education sector, there is also contrasting and non conclusive evidence regarding the relatively recent claims that emigration may be an incentive to education and human capital formation in origin areas (Ibidem), and the schooling effects of migration would also depend on labor market insertion of migrants (De Haas 2010). Meyer calls for qualitative
research in this respect, besides the need of improved data on skills levels of migrants in the South (2008).

The negative economic impact of drain in sending areas was however accompanied by other findings about non economic impacts. A critical achievement of work on transnationalism was to give a sense of the importance of cultural change developed in and transmitted through transnational spaces, which affects gender and age hierarchies, sometimes reinforcing elements in them and sometimes changing them, to put these effects simply, in De Haas’ terms (2009). Transnationalism sees movement outside the developmentalist national framing, and locates movement in multi-local spaces, addressing material and symbolic changes and their interconnections throughout the life course and across generations; transnational networks are the mechanisms of these changes (Gasper and Truong 2013). ACP (2012) recently proposed a guide to study SS transnational families taking into account non Western notions of family such as extended kin and networks, non shared residency and maintenance of social, cultural, reproductive and income links, as well as engagement in reproduction and income earning activities.

To some extent, the distinction between the brain drain/gain views of diasporas overlaps with transnationalism. Hujo and Piper (2010) suggest that, although the ideas of social capital and political remittances that are associated to transnationalism carry a Western bias, ‘The empirical emergence of intraregional advocacy networks and the conceptual emergence of “social movement unionism” deriving from the Southern experience, however, indicate the impetus given to the politicization of migration and development by individual migrants in the form of collective efforts that come from the South’ (2010: 34). It is hard to foresee how politicization of migration in the South may interact with ever changing exclusionary practices.

b. Xenophobia and Exclusion

In research about growing xenophobia in South destination countries, Crush (2009) also brings out the biases derived from the SNM literature, that relates xenophobia to: cultural contact, crime and asylum-seekers; nationalism and the related rise of the extreme right, alleged cultural differences, real competition over limited resources; and perceived rather than real economic threats. As mentioned before, Crush argues that although xenophobic tendencies can be treated as contextual factors, they respond to broader changes in political, social, and economic structures, including political and economic integration of countries. This is an important call to not leave aside the study of the effects of
structural changes affecting unprivileged excluded populations or groups of the North. Crush goes as far as claiming that continued discriminatory treatment of migrant groups can contribute, in the long-term, to the emergence of a new social (world) underclass. This argument resonates with Gasper and Truong’s observations about how the persistence of systems unilaterally imposed by the North on the South can ‘boomerang’ or ‘talk back’ through the most negative forms of transnationalism, such as organized crime and the spread of conflicts (2013: 372).

Unfortunately, in contrast to Crush’s careful analysis of the appropriateness of the idea of xenophobia to the SSM contexts, a number of works simply adopt a readymade perspective. Perhaps the most problematic barriers to mobility are in the minds of ‘scholars’, media and policy representations of migrants. An example of this type of literature is Gagnon and Khoudour-Castéras’s work, which adapts migration management discourses, proposing to learn from the European experiences of immigration. The authors commend West African governments to give priority to policies to address the problems of migrants’ integration before tensions are ‘too difficult to manage’ (2012: 7). Their own arguments suggest though that the West Africa contexts leave margins for flexibility and mutual adjustment between migrant and non migrant populations (on African mobilities see for example Brachet 2011 and 2012). If problems stemming from contexts of widespread social exclusion are subsumed in the language of integration or incorporation, then the calls for enforcement of rights and for fighting discrimination are also subjected to artificial introduction of some Western immigration views. A good contrast to this reading is the paper by Adams (2013) that offers a content analysis of media representations of Peruvian migrants to Chile. This article illustrates how the adoption of the multiculturalism language and of a framing of immigration taken from Northern immigration countries, introduces views detached from the local contexts that are problematic for migrants. Unfortunately, works like Adams’ are still very scarce in the study of SSM.

c. Econometric studies

Econometric studies have attempted to show regularities of migration movements in relation to economic performance of countries. This type of research is now extended to SSM. An example is the theoretical model of a dualistic economic structure (formal-modern/informal-traditional) proposed as suitable to capture the economic structure of developing countries in the South; conflict and environment are further incorporated in this migration model as migration drivers specific to the South
(Andreopulos et al 2005). In a second article, the authors further specify this model for a theoretical
country of very low development and discuss alleged delays in industrialization and wages
consequences, as a result of SSM economic and labor market distortions (Andreopulos et al 2006).
These views of SSM migration bear clear elements of the modernization paradigm as mentioned earlier.

Another extension of previous econometric international migration studies are the mentioned
approaches linked to the New Economics of Labor Migration (NELM). The key difference with classical
economics research is that households, rather than individuals, are taken as the unit of analysis, under
the reasoning that migration by one or more members is part of a strategy to reduce economic
insecurity of the households. This type of study is also concerned with country development as a
determinant of migration decisions, but the propensity to move is seen as mediated by the effects of
household relations and/or by the operation of institutions or social norms, market failures and
information asymmetries.

In general, in such work emigration from a country is typically expected to increase as economic
development increases, up to a high level of economic development in the origin country, when
emigration begins to fall. The following two examples of empirically applied econometric research show
an explicit interest in SSM. These studies must take into account bilateral country development
differentials and also use control variables to exclude the influence of non economic links between
countries.

The first article is Dumont et. al. (2010) which argues that migration with respect to country-income
levels of both origin and destination countries is not the same for OECD (representing the North) and
non OECD countries (the South). It should be noticed that the development context is seen as consisting
of country development rather than individuals’ or households’ development, and as affecting their
capacity to move. The authors estimate emigration rates of 230 sending countries, and differences
across the movement of skilled and non skilled migrants, for which they use data for 28 OECD and 61
non OECD destination countries. They conclude that emigration rates to non OECD countries (here
representing SSM) increase steadily as the level of sender country income decreases, and this linear
negative relation would be more pronounced for skilled migration. Since an inverted u-shape relation\textsuperscript{16} for international migration and country income levels is rejected, SSM would continue over time regardless of the differentials in the level of development of the two countries in question. The proposed implication is that SSM would not affect the level of development of the origin countries.

The second article, by Cummins et. al. (2009), also explores bilateral migration relations between country income differentials and migration, considering 127 OECD and non OECD countries. This work includes variables such as life expectancy and educational attainment, to complement indicators of country development level with individual development. However, in contrast to the previous work, the authors affirm a non linear negative relation between origin country development situation and migration to non OECD countries; the inverted u shape for SSM, rejected by the previous study, would thus hold. The proposed implication is that as the economic differentials of the two countries decrease, migration from the less to the more developed country would tend to decrease as well.

On the other hand, Cummins et. al. (2009) also conclude that the origin country economy is not sure to benefit from migration. This is tested in another hypothetical u-shape relation in which origin country income would increase as emigration rates increase, up to a point where country development would be similar to the development of the destination country, and thus emigration rates would begin to fall. This finding contradicts arguments about positive effects of migrant networks and diasporas on the development of origin countries, though not necessarily the effects on an individual’s development.

Findings between these two studies are thus contradictory. If we are to believe them, except for an initial relevance of country economic development differentials to initiate migration from relatively less to relatively more developed countries, there is nothing certain. Thus, even in these econometric interpretations, since SSM (just as SNM) involves development differentials, migration may or may not have a longer term impact on development; neither may development differentials, in the longer term, be closely related to the extent of movements across countries in the South because of networks’ intervention in the perpetuation of movements. The differentials are just confirmed as initial migration forces; human action is perceived to affect the chances to improve household or individual economic security but within a given set of fixed development options at one point in time.

\textsuperscript{16} This inverted u-shape represents a relation in which international migration follows a curved or non linear relation (no one-to-one change) in which emigration increases with developmental achievement, up to a point of high development where emigration turns into increasing negative migration or immigration.
Despite how little these studies can affirm (which itself is not insignificant), we can expect SSM debates on whether country development differentials are migration ‘drivers’ to continue along these lines, just as the debates on international migration have done. In NELM studies, emigration rates may also respond to variables assumed to reflect economic (trade), geographic (distance) or cultural (language, colonialism history) inter-country ties, but the mechanisms or the relative extent of such effects are much harder to specify in quantitative representations. Furthermore, the contradictions between findings regarding empirical patterns at a macroeconomic level (here for all except non initial migration) reflect that movements are contingent also on social relations and structures (De Haas 2009: 46), and thus should not be expected to be well-captured by highly generalized conclusions.\textsuperscript{17}

6. TRANSCONTINENTAL TWO WAY MOVEMENTS: CHINA-AFRICA

South-South flows across long distances are beginning to be discussed in the scientific and expert literatures about migration. Besides historical migrations across Asia and Africa and more recent migrations since the 1960s and 1980s, new migrations of Chinese to African areas are beginning to gain special attention. This section of the review takes up China-Africa movements as an illustrative case. Note first that this literature is focusing on the links between small and large scale trade and investments across these continents, involving small traders and entrepreneurs, while movements of laborers or other working migrants receive far less attention. Further, in the articles included in this section, only Mohan and Kale (2010) mention the term SSM.

a. Trade and Chinese-African Movements

\textsuperscript{17} It is worth mentioning an economic theoretical discussion about ‘mass dynamics’ driven by expectations that result in an overall equilibrium change. In his critique of migration policy research, particularly those informed by neoclassical approaches to migration, Ellerman questions the assumption of the equalizing dynamics at work in migration-development, by asking: are flows part of a critical mass dynamics driving one region to a low equilibrium away from a high equilibrium? and the reverse in another region, or ‘are flows part of an equilibrating dynamics reducing the push and pull factors between two countries and regions?’ (2003: 9). Ellerman thinks that the first is the case for SSM migration, while NN migration is the second; his crude application of this ‘dynamics’ reasoning to the brain gain/drain debates suggests that neither development at origin policies nor migration as a safety valve are developmental solutions, given that exit of the ‘best and brightest’ relieves the pressures for change, and reinforces the South/North divide (internally and internationally), as well as the ‘self image’ of ghettoization in which only individual success is possible (2003).
Since at least the 1980s, there seem to be increased and/or changing flows of Chinese migrants in many areas of Africa. These movements have been argued to be part of a project to increase Chinese influence in the continent and even take over international leadership in Africa (Ma Mung 2008). It has also sometimes been suggested that the government of China may be attempting to foster a nationalist ideology in some places abroad. For this purpose, the political discourse of the Chinese government towards Chinese diasporas is now focused on technology and knowledge transfers, and remittances for less affluent migrants, as a patriotic obligation (Liu 2005).

Mohan and Kale (2010) make a review of literature focusing on Chinese investments and infrastructure in Africa, concluding that the presence of diasporas depends on the nature of the economic ties, the size of the communities, and the institutionalisation of governments’ bilateral policies. However, the presence of Chinese diasporas is suspected to form part of a long term project. For this reason, this report to the Rockefeller Foundation proposes a research agenda on the following areas: country case studies; ownership patterns of Chinese trading firms; assessments of technology transfers of Chinese resource extractive industries that are part of an ‘open door policy’; and monitoring of the possibility that migration policies and investment could be steered together (Ibidem).

Park (2009) and Huyn et. al. (2010) rebut this type of argument and bring out the role of Western media representations of Chinese migrants as part of a growing negative context towards Chinese migrations, also visible in positions within some governments. They argue that recent movements are of unprivileged independent migrants. Although they have moved in and between spaces created by bilateral government relations, these authors consider it necessary to distinguish them from movements directed by the state and those involving multinational Chinese corporations. Sautman and Hairong (2007) also contrast the distinctiveness of the involvement of China in Africa, in the form of foreign investment and infrastructure loans, on the one hand, and aid and migration policies, on the other, arguing that it could have more developmental impact compared to Western participation in Africa after the Washington and Post-Washington Consensuses.

Carling and Østbø Haugen’s study of Chinese entrepreneurs to Cape Verde (2005) supports former studies of Chinese ethnic business movements to local areas of economies in transition with the objective of supplying goods in shortage. These authors suggest that competition between increasing numbers of entrepreneurs supplying scarce consumption goods is linked to saturation of local markets.
Other authors also notice that goods from China, even if low quality, are cheaper and thus more accessible to the local populations (Park 2009; Bakewell and Jónsson 2011; Carling and Østbø Haugen 2005), and often African small shops cannot compete with them (Park 2009). Dobler (2008) provides a different view of these trends, by reconstructing the role of Chinese and Pakistani small entrepreneurs in facilitating new trade routes independent of Northern countries in a small town in Namibia, bordering with Angola. Alongside diplomatically brokered relations (from Brazil), these types of trade relations are seen as creating new dependencies within the South. This would help to understand research from the North concerned with the possibility that the scale and dynamism of the Chinese communities may be used to shape economic, social and political relations in the future (Mohan and Kale 2010).

By 2001 there could have been 137,000 Chinese in Africa, according to the Ohio University database (Sautman and Hairong 2007). An update of this table estimates a range between 583,050 and 820,050 total migrants for years between 2003 and 2007. The highest flows would be in ranges between 20,000 and 40,000 in Angola; 3,000–10,000 in Botswana; 1,000–7,000 in Cameroon; 500-10,000 in DRC; 20,000-74,000 in Sudan; 6,000–10,000 in Egypt; 3,000–7,000 in Ethiopia; 5,000–8,000 in Gabon; 3,000–4,000 in Mali; 3,000–20,000 in Tanzania; 50,000-100,000 in Uganda; 5,300-10,000 in Zimbabwe; 60,000 in Madagascar; 25,000 in Reunion; 200,000-400,000 in South Africa, 100,000 in Nigeria; 20,000 in Algeria; 10,000 in Cote d’Ivoire; +7,000 in Kenya; the remaining flows would be highly dispersed across around 15 more countries (Park 2009: 4). These data are only an indicator of the recent growth in movements of migrants from China, and I have not found data disaggregated by sex or age.

Several authors mention links with former Chinese migrations from Guangdong, Zhejiang, and Fujian provinces that have long traditions of out-migration. Since the 1990s, other places of origin are urban areas of Beijing, Tianjin and Shanghai (Park 2009) and also Liaoning and Heilongjiang in the North East, and Hubei in central China (Ma Mung 2008). The means to enter Africa would be government to government agreements and Chinese licensed private employment agencies, mainly for workers in infrastructure projects; and social networks and smugglers or traffickers for small traders and similar migrants (Park 2009).

Four distinctive patterns of new Chinese migrations to Africa have been identified. The first covers between 80,000 and 130,000 contractual temporary (2-3 years) migrants linked to infrastructure projects developed by Chinese state owned enterprises or to multinational corporations in most
countries since the end of 1990s; the majority of them would involve semi-skilled and a minority of skilled labor. Second, labor migrants who go to Africa and stay while waiting for opportunities to move to Northern countries (see Ma Mung 2008; Park 2009). Third, there are farmers or agricultural migrants in Kenya, Uganda, Ghana and Senegal mostly from Hubei Province, and also in Zimbabwe, Zambia and South Africa (Park 2009; Sautman and Hairong 2007). Finally, the majority of migrants appear to be small traders, sometimes with family or kinship ties, moving independently to start their business in cities and small towns of African countries, and following avenues formerly opened by diplomats, professional company workers or Taiwanese business. There are also wholesalers or merchants established in big cities, Johannesburg being the most important (Park 2009). Similar patterns are mentioned in a study of trade trajectories from China to West Africa. The emerging negative image about the role of small Chinese traders arrived in the last decade. Tensions in the competition with local African traders in Ghana and Senegal, for example, could be the result of: operations of Chinese or African big entrepreneurs in highly competitive trade markets; the roles of informal networks in facilitating the movement of Chinese small entrepreneurs; and the social obligations of local African traders (Marfaing and Thiel 2011).

b. Africans in China

There is also an emerging literature about the reverse connection, to China from Africa, involving links between trade relations, development cooperation and the commercialization of the migration process resulting from the diversification of migration associated to more restrictive immigration policies in the North. Bakewell and Jónsson (2011) study short term movements of African market traders from main or secondary cities of Ghana and Nigeria to China, who would be helped to deal with language barriers and information by co-national migrants living in those countries. These authors discuss the possibility that the local economic activities surrounding trade links with China may be more beneficial than the often isolated large scale trade operations and extractive industries owned by Western companies.

Recent complementary research on the South of China is analyzing the bridging roles of Nigerian African communities in Guangzhou, as well as Macau and Hong Kong, emerging in the last decade (Morais 2009; Bodomo 2010, 2011, 2012). Morais distinguishes three different communities made up of: first, business people who regularly travel but do not stay; second, settler African traders, particularly Nigerians running local business, marrying Chinese women and establishing a web of formal and informal networks; and third, a new form, Nigerian students moving aside from Chinese scholarships to study in
Macau. Morais further argues that the experiences of these communities contrasts with the official discourse of cultural diversity, and that they are finding ways to negotiate their social integration in the opportunities offered by the local society (2009).

Other studies approach these movements from the perspective of ‘low end globalization’ or grassroots transnationalism occurring in the informal economic and trade activity in the margins of the law (Mathews et. al. 2012; Lyons et. al. 2012). Due to the short term visas obtained, Igbo and other West African traders and labourers in Guangzhou would pursue various strategies, such as overstaying their visas in order to carry on with their business, and hiding from or bribing the police to know in advance in case of raids. Similarly, if risks are too high, they may return to Africa, seek a romantic relation with socially marginalized women, or search for support groups; traders may move to countries like Thailand, Vietnam and Malaysia, in search of cheaper goods. In this view, the role of China as manufacturer of cheap goods enables other developing regions to experience globalization (Mathews et. al. 2012).

Østbø Haugen presents a less positive view of Nigerian migrations to the trading hub of Guangzhou, China, as a result of diversification of migration flows, commercialization of migration processes and restrictive immigration policies in developed countries (2009). The specific circumstances of little information in Nigeria about China, coupled with the widespread brokering of visas, make China appear as an attractive transit destination (Ibidem). As a result, Nigerian migrants escaping from involuntary immobility can end up trapped in China, where the government has opted for reinforcing policing of borders in the absence of a policy to manage migration (Ibidem).

c. Recent Chinese Migrations to South Africa

Amongst the diverse patterns of new migration to Africa, movements to South Africa are the most visible and perhaps most important. According to Park, this country is the transit point in step migration to other African cities (2009). Available estimates calculate between 200,000 and 350,000 newly arrived Chinese migrants since the end of the Apartheid Regime in the mid 1990s (Huyn et. al., 2010). Before 2000, migrations would have consisted of managers and business people linked to imports, retail and wholesale trading, and manufacturing of consumer products including business men from Taiwan and Hong Kong (Huyn et. al. 2010). After 2000, besides temporary contract laborers, most migrants are reported to be small traders or peasants with insufficient qualifications or resources to move to North
America, Europe or Australia. Most of them move in chain and come from the province of Fujian. Many are believed to have entered illegally from neighboring countries, to speak little English and have few or no networks (Huyn et. al. 2010). These authors also distinguish between a minority of ‘cosmopolitan’ business people that can invest in one or more cities, who tend to travel often to China and to have their children in private schools; and on the other hand small entrepreneurs with more limited means, often living in the back of their business premises, and even sending their children back to China to be raised by their grandparents. Unlike immigrants who have been established in South Africa for at least ten years, the ‘latecomers’ would have found saturated markets and moved to the margins in smaller cities or towns, and some of them work in small business until they earn enough to travel back to China (Huyn et. al., 2010).

In another study, Park and Erasmus analyse the changes in Post-Apartheid legislation in South Africa, in relation to the former definition of the Chinese as a ‘previously disadvantaged group’, and the recent decision by the courts to exclude Chinese migrants that arrived after 1994, as well as other immigrants from Africa, from this definition. The authors conclude that the Chinese case proves that the policies of redress in South Africa, attempting to construct more inclusive notions of citizenship have not overcome the significance of racial classifications (2008). Wa Kabwe-Seggaty and Landau (2008) undertake a reconstruction of the processes of reform to immigration policy from 1990 to 2006. These authors conclude that the state has shown a remarkable capacity to work with the inherited migration system, given the context of growing xenophobia and changing migratory situation, as well as the bureaucratic resistances hardening immigration control and putting obstacles to the enforcement of laws granting citizenship and access to basic services.

7. CONCLUSION: ISSUES OF STRUCTURE AND AGENCY

The scope of SSM has led us into a critical review of migration debates of the last half century, with the advantage that much has been achieved in terms of awareness of human sciences paradigms. Cross fertilization between thinking about agency and about structure has generated richer views of migration, contributing to overcome the contradictory assumptions—individual choice and simultaneous pre-determination of such choices—that dominated the modernization paradigm.
Examples of this cross fertilization in SSM research are the works of Hugo and Piper (2007, 2010), De Haas (2009), Truong et. al. (2013), and Gasper and Truong (2013).

SSM as a research direction is facing criticism, particularly if the approach considers only the agency side of movement. Thus Bakewell’s (2009) extensive review of SSM work questions its distinctiveness. Departing from human mobility as a historical feature of human lives in the South, and observing the rise and fall of migration poles, the diversification of destinations, the ‘feminization’ of mobility and the mixing of types of migrants (refugees/economic) reflects local or regional power issues or reductions in transport and communications costs. This interpretation is further reinforced by the contemporary pattern of highest mobility among developing countries which also reflects relative bilateral levels of development. If against this background, livelihoods, political crises, education and marriage are seen as the distinctive SSM drivers, and migration policies merely respond to people’s movement, then the effects of other roles of the states in the broader terrain of global engagements may be lost from sight.

A similar case is the UNDP Human Development Report (2009), whose rich and broad scope analysis is led by concern with human mobility as mainly a positive expression of agency or freedom. Although inequality appears as a major migration driver (on the pull side, as opportunity differentials), transnational economic forces are ruled out as a possible cause of worsening of well-being after movement. Such situations would only reflect the intersection of induced movement and movement conditions (p. 16). In the background, the cost of migration increased by movement restrictions is considered the obstacle to improved well being. This framing entails that structural factors are unwisely limited to an overarching unexplained inequality and to movement restrictions of nation states. Thus, the effects of the distribution of unequal opportunities are considered only within local hierarchies: the households (leavers vs stayers) or at a local level (within communities), and induced movement can supposedly only be the result of conflict, the environment and/or of displacement generated by particular development projects.

Bakewell and UNDP may be right in that movement to the South may not be qualitatively different to movement to the North or from rural-urban, internal or international migration. The problem is that giving little attention to the role of transnational structures may leave space for simplified views arguing that ‘sustained economic growth in some developing countries has led to increases’ in SSM (IOM 2011: 49). In contrast, Truong et. al. reflect on the usefulness of human security precisely as a framework that
enables attention to social justice concerns and human vulnerability (2013). If the entry points for analysis are through transnational structures, for example the global gendered labor demands and demographic change, then the features of the sort discussed by Bakewell also are revealed to show a more local/regional dimension. Hujo and Piper’s (2010) concern with the social and economic dimensions of SSM migration and their relations to development, rather than mainly with human mobility as an expression of agency, also provides a broader view, where migration is simultaneously shaped by global, regional and local drivers and, we could say, ‘pushers’.

De Haas (2009) presents a historically informed review of the dynamic and dialectical relations between structure and agency. His critique of the view of mobility as a promising development strategy (for the South) argues that improvements in livelihood strategies are critically conditioned by structural factors related to capitalism and state building on the structure side. While mainstream research stresses the potential developmental impacts of SSM despite the roles of inequalities as discussed in the previous sections, the field of SSM studies requires a new wave of migration research focused on the relevance of structures and inequalities. Political economy approaches are greatly needed, but their potential contributions are still a taboo in mainstream research, still bearing the brunt of the failed communist experience of the past century, and despite so much progress in terms of awareness of mistaken Marxist modernization assumptions and of misleading political projects of nation states elites serving themselves while talking of social justice ideals.

It should be noticed that Bakewell (2009), De Haas (2009) and Hujo and Piper (2010) give credit to the relevance of migration livelihood strategies in SSM and to NELM findings about migration as an insurance mechanism against economic insecurity in developing countries. If these factors and others like education and marriage, and even country development situation, are approached through the thread of gender and life course, it is more likely that the relevant aspects of structure and agency will show their contradictory forces and faces. Hujo and Piper (2007) argue that exploring the effects of migration on social development at a macro level must consider economic, social, political and distributional consequences. They also provide a preliminary analytical framework that considers the role of social reproduction in the Southern contexts of fragile and fragmented arrangements for social protection, compared to the more integrated systems in the North (see also Parvati and Raghuram 2010). At a macro or global level, the reproduction dimension of migration in the South would have functions of social welfare which involve gendered redistributions within the household, between
countries (productivity, macroeconomic stability and social conflict smoothing) and between the North and the South in the filling of world care demands (2010: 16-18; see also Truong, et. al. 2013: 8).

However, these dimensions are hardly ever re-cognized beyond the recent discussions about the public/private gendered framings of ‘productive work’, probably as a lagged effect of the sedentary bias of international migration research, where movement is largely still seen as ‘abnormal’ rather than as part of both globalization and human lives (Gasper and Truong 2013). Rather than only as containers for closed communities as in the recent past, currently nation states are beginning to be critically recognized as forces interacting with the operation of transnational market forces. Focusing in a geographic scope as broad as SSM, and viewing the South less in terms of changes in country economic performance and more in terms of the consequences that the national engagements in globalization have over in/security in the lives of people, may contribute to more nuanced explanations of the transnational connections in which nation states operate.

Although patterns of an old order, anchored in the dichotomies North-South, rural-urban, national-international, weak-strong, feminine-masculine (see Gasper and Truong 2013), are still shaping notions of the world, the ‘rise’/’emergence’ of the South that accompanies globalization may imply that distinctive dynamics formerly and still obscured by the teleology of modernization may now dazzle our sight. This challenges our epistemological imagination to make sense of long term domination burdens in the contemporary South. At the same time, self recognition entails acknowledging the ingenious strategies developed through the need to cope with alien exploitation, but challenges our capacity to also see the dimensions of self failure that may have prevented the possibility to achieve less exclusionary worlds.
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9. ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY


   The note contains a conceptual guide to the study of migration and transnational families in the South, noting that this area has mainly been studied with a focus in NSM. It is organized in three main parts: 1) Definition and data about social impacts of mobility on transnational families (western concept vs large kinship network; questions over the notion of shared residency and maintenance of social, cultural, reproductive and income links; engagement in reproduction and income earning activities). 2) Background and types of social impacts of transnational family life (changing values and identity; family structures and social networks; impact on family members). 3. Recommendations and good practices. The note was prepared by Susanne Melde, Research Officer at ACP Observatory on Migration.


   Based on news articles in two local and one national newspapers, the paper attempts a content analysis of representations of Peruvian migrants to Chile, in the context of the immigration debate around 2006-2009. Although limited in evidence, it argues that media treatment of Peruvian migrants reflect views pertaining to the language of social incorporation used in immigration societies. This is a noticeable choice given that subjects of both countries speak the same tongue, have geographic proximity and similar characteristics, with the result that importance is given to class and ethnicity (indigenous heritage) differences pertaining to the language of multiculturalism, and despite media awareness of general social acceptance of shared characteristics. The use of linguistic markers tied to ethnicity entails the assumption that there are no racial or class obstacles to overcome in ‘social incorporation’, thus hiding these dimensions. Given the concluding thought that SSM involves many social similarities and differences, the paper provides an interesting window to research SSM framings in languages of incorporation. The work gives some attention to women migrants. Adams is a Ph.D. student at the University of Texas at Austin.


   This article is a general discussion about the dynamism of migration flows in the geographic areas of three intra-regional agreements of Sub-Saharan Africa, ECOWAS, SADC and COMESA, involving policies for the free movement of people within overlapping geographical areas. Departing from an African context marked by considerable instability and underdevelopment, demographic and unemployment pressures, the discussion is about diversification of and alternation in origin and destination countries, politically driven expulsion of refugees and migrants, and reversals of some countries’ liberal immigration policies as constraints. It claims that brain circulation has substituted brain drain; brings in the diversification of migrants; and calls for further economic and migration integration. About half of the limited bibliography consists of the author’s work. Adepoju is based at the Human Resources Development Centre of Lagos, Nigeria.

This is one of the first attempts to model South-South Migration within economic theories. The Lewis model for a dualistic economic structure (formal-modern/informal-traditional) is proposed as suiting developing countries. The model is presented theoretically. It proposes conflict (refugees and displaced migrants) and environmental factors as migration drivers (besides country economic disparities) proper amongst South-South migration drivers. It separately stresses ‘security risks’ consequences.

The authors are based at William Patterson University, USA.


This paper is an extension of a former paper by the same authors, except Antoniou, about the effects of SSM (understood as migration between developing countries) on economic development. It specifies the authors’ former adaptation of the Lewis two stage of development model to a theoretical country of very low development and with high number of refugees. The paper presents the main characteristics of South-South migration (economic disparities, conflict and environment as involuntary migration drivers); and explains the Lewis model introducing international migration. It concludes that at a very early stage of development, the increase in surplus labour will delay modernization and wages will remain constant; and proposes to separate refugees from army camps, and to implement integration policies to empower people.

The authors are based at William Patterson University, USA.


The paper approaches Asian migration from the perspective of ‘knowledge production’, to outline some of the ways in which selected aspects of knowledge about migration and development are being produced in the region, and the research imagination resulting from existing approaches. The authors focus in the role of research centers operating in, and publications that emerge from this region. The central assumption is that knowledge processes shape research questions, the valuing of particular topics, and the formulation of criteria for inclusion and exclusion. The analysis is organized in four sections outlined below:

1) Mismatch in knowledges interrogation, with greater interest in knowledge production about development, and less about how knowledge of migration is produced (mainly research of programmatic quality or policy oriented); 2) An outline of the main epistemologies and paradigms, including calculative processes, investigative nodes; and political models and policy imperatives; 3) Limitations and lacunae produced by existing knowledge frameworks, including *empirical lacunae*, *categorical lacunae*, and theoretical and methodological limitations. 4) Migration research infrastructure and its role in knowledge production.

The authors precise the scope of the paper: a broad view of the links between migration and development, seeing migration as a process that is inherently embedded in multiple personal, social and institutional frameworks; a primary (but not exclusive) focus on studies and publications by scholars within Asia; a geographic emigration focus that mostly refers to East, South and South-East Asia, overall excluding West Asia and the post-Soviet countries of Central Asia. The authors notice linguistic shortcomings of their paper, despite the fact that English is the main research and policy language in the
region, but with variations by country, by topic, by academic hierarchies and the extent of the publishing industries.

Piper is researcher at the University of Sydney; she specializes in the governance of migration and has significant work in gender and migration in Asia and Latin America:  

Asis is Director of Publications at Scalabrini Migration Center, Phillipines:  
http://www.smc.org.ph/  
(institutional website)

Raghuram is researcher at the Open University, UK; she specializes on mobility and knowledge production:  
http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/staff/people-profile.php?name=Parvati_Raghuram


Through the comparison of gendered migration, this paper proposes to broaden our understanding of the tensions between the governments’ failed policies to sustain temporary flows and the movements of labor across borders. Beyond the particularities of female migration and gender relations, the author aims to a long-term historical analysis of migration between countries in Asia from a multi-level perspective. The author argues that there is enough research to start answering questions about policy making processes that will trigger development, not only for the economy of the origin and receiving countries, but also for migrants’ lives.

Asis Director of Publications is at Scalabrini Migration Center, Phillipines.


This is one of the first South-South migration overviews, focusing in Africa and secondarily in Asia. It includes a useful discussion on the problems to define the South-South migration category and a brief historical review. From an agency led approach to migration, the paper discusses migration drivers; development impacts, and the role of the state. The author has done extensive work on migration in Africa, and he is Co-director and Senior Researcher in the International Migration Institute of the University of Oxford.  
http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/about-us/people/index/oliver-bakewell

&lt;http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/pdfs/research-projects-pdfs/aphm-pdfs/aphm-synthesis-report-2011&gt;

Based in four case studies using extensive surveys and interviews from research partners in country universities, the article questions the literature about African cities (and its absence), as either simplistic or agency overlooking. The first two field research cases are undertaken in city markets (Accra and Kumasi, Ghana; Lagos, Nigeria), and focus in day to day mobility of market traders; the remaining two (Fes, Morocco; Lubumbashi, DRC) interview migrants from Morocco and DRC, from other African countries and from the West. The authors argue that Africa is not just about emigration, structural incorporation and labour. International, national (cross border) and internal migration are linked in the African context through the cities. They propose a migration systems approach as a starting point to understand these relations. Bakewell has done extensive work about migration in Africa, and he is senior researcher in the International Migration Institute of the University of Oxford:
Jonsson is research assistant at the same institution.


This case study researches SSM in relation to the consequences of migrant policies in peoples’ lives, identity and status in society. Based on 40 interviews to Haitian migrants’ children born in the Dominican Republic in urban areas, the paper explores government’s problematic policies to integrate migrants ‘in transit’. The paper shows the administrative consequences of the lack of access to documents such as births certificates, and the ultimate denial of rights to education of children. Dependence on social networks to secure basic education further exposes Haitian's descendants, especially those of darker-skin, to verbal and physical abuse.

Bartlett is Associate Professor at Teachers College, Columbia University.


The paper discusses the role of international organizations in the diffusion and promotion of human rights of migrants, with a focus in women migrants, in Chile, Argentina, Mexico and Costa Rica. From a sociological new institutionalism approach to dissemination of human rights standards, they discuss the international and regional institutions linked to migrants and female migrants in these countries; the available mechanisms for the promotion of rights; and the progress and limitations in the advancement of rights. They question the autonomy of international governmental organizations, given the absence of most UN agencies in migration policy work in these countries. The unfinished paper is part of a broader research project funded by the International Development and Research Council of Canada.

Basok is the Director of the Centre for Studies in Social Justice of the University of Windsor, Canada and her research focus is in migrant’s rights especially within the USA and Canada.

Piper is researcher at the University of Sydney; she specializes in the governance of migration and has significant work in gender and migration in Asia and Latin America:


Based on a mix of quantitative and qualitative studies, as well as participant observation, this book analyses African diaspora communities in Guangzhou, Yiwu, Shangai, Beijing, Hong Kong and Macau. The author provides insights about the reasons to travel to China, as well as the activities, opportunities and problems faced by these sojourners. It proposes a cross-cultural bridge theory of migrant-indigene relations. The book addresses cultural manifestations such as restaurants and art collections, to discuss how Africans live their lives and interact in the Chinese context. Considering national, religious, trade, ethnic, institutional, racial and educational features based on language, communications and cultural expressions, it attempts to explain what is like to be an African in China.

Bodomo is researcher and director of the African Studies Programme at the University of Hong Kong.

This paper analyses food, restaurant locations and food-eating habits of African communities from West Africa and the Maghreb living in Guangzhou and Yiwu provinces of China, to understand the role of providing structures and community bonding that shape identities and community formation.

Bodomo is researcher and director of the African Studies Programme at the University of Hong Kong.

Ma is at Zhejiang Normal University, China.

Bodomo is researcher and director of the African Studies Programme at the University of Hong Kong.


This article analyses an emerging African trading community in Guangzhou, China and their role in bridging trade relations between African sending communities and host communities in Africa. Socio-linguistic and socio-economic profiles of a reduced number of African migrants in Guangzhou are elaborated based on a questionnaire, in-depth interviews, and participant-observation. Information about reasons to go to Guangzhou, their origin in Africa, means of communication and socio-economic activities is presented. The author argues that this community acts as a bridge for Africa-China relations, but at the same time they face harassment by law enforcement officials.

Bodomo is researcher and director of the African Studies Programme at the University of Hong Kong.


This paper proposes the study of *transit migration* as a significant moment of cross border migration that enables to study migration as a continuum and a non fixed, fluid process. By two years in site observation combined with interviews methods, the author undertakes a *transit migration* exercise in the Saharan routes originating in West and Central Africa, with the great majority of migrants heading to Algeria and Libya as intended or unintended destination. Focused in illegal migrant taxation practices in the Agadez region in Niger, and in the emerging sociability of migrants, four transit routes are studied to estimate flows and costs.

Brachet is researcher at the Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (Institute of Research for Development) and the University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne - IRD. He specializes in migration, trafficking and merchant trade in the central Sahara.


The chapter analyses the dynamic nature and current changes in the Saharan migration system, focusing on Niger, Algeria and Libya. One of the main arguments is that external pressures (from the European
Union) on Saharan transit countries are breaking up the historical migration patterns that have been so significant for the economic development of the region. In a context of contradictions in the migration policies of Algeria and Libya, and of reproduction of Eurocentric representations of migrants, attempts to manage migration flows are affecting legal and illegal forms of trade and transport, and contributing to increased smuggling with the consequent security risks for migrants.

Brachet is researcher at the Institut de Recherche pour le Développement (Institute of Research for Development) and the University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne - IRD. He specializes in migration, trafficking and merchant trade in the central Sahara.


This report documents the transformation of migration systems during the process of regional market’s integration of the Greater Mekong Sub-region (Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam and the Chinese provinces of Yunnan and Guangxi). It is argued that rapid investment, and infrastructure expansion combined with growing geo-political and socio-cultural inequalities shape migration in the region. Migrants from poor countries tend to be unskilled and irregular, and only skilled migrants have access to countries with stronger economies. Mapping the diversity of migratory policies among the countries that are part of the sub-region, the paper discusses the negative impacts that the absence of labour market regulation and integration has on migrants’ lives. In this sense, the report gives insights to reforms needed in order to regulate migration in a region where historic and social particularities have denied citizenship to minority ethnic groups. Beyond actions against illegal traffic of persons and the creation of labour registration schemes, it proposes to explore the role of segmented labour markets in structuring the demand for unskilled labour and the wage structures in different sectors. Understanding the relation migration-development requires data to evaluate the social impacts (positive and negative) of migration, which is currently unavailable, and to assess the costs and benefits of migration for migrants, communities and the countries in the sub-region. However, the report documents how receiving societies deny migrants’ contributions, and how the benefits of migration to sending countries have yet to be maximized. Policies and intervention should thus attempt to provide legal protection against the vulnerable conditions in which migrants live.

Theresa Caouette, is at the Institute for Population and Social Research, Mahidol University, Thailand; Rosalia Sciortino, is Regional Director of the Southeast and East-Asia-IDRC.


The article discusses the dynamics of Chinese migration and markets saturation in Cape Verde. Using a typology of Chinese entrepreneurial migration developed in studies about Chinese migration to Central and Eastern Europe as a framework, the authors argue that Chinese entrepreneurs migrate to regions that are out-migration areas, and where their local economies are in transition. Chinese migrant entrepreneurs would fill goods’ supply shortages in these economies. It is further is argued that Chinese perceive that only those who arrive first will make greater profits, and local markets saturation is directly linked to competition from those who continue arriving from China to integrate in the same “Chinese niches”.

56
Carling is a Research Professor in international migration and transnationalism studies at the Peace Research Institute Oslo (PRIO); Østbø Haugen is a Postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Oslo in the Department of Sociology and Human Geography.


Beyond intra-regional migration in South America and increased emigration trends to the developed world after 2000, this article describes the ‘feminization’ of migration within South America. It argues that migration empowers women and improves the quality lives of those who receive their remittances back home. The author holds that women should not be seen as victims in the labour markets, even if discrimination against them persists. After discussing women’s agency, she examines how decisions to migrate are determined by economic factors. She notices that choices to stay for longer periods and bring their children with them are related to migration management policies amongst the MERCOSUR countries. In the case of Argentina, the fact that health assistance and public education is universal, including for irregular migrants has become an incentive to women’s migration. Finally the paper explores female illegal traffic in the region.

Marcela Cerrutti is Professor of Sociology at the University of Buenos Aires.


Based on qualitative research techniques with Peruvian domestic workers in Chile (mothers and non-mothers), the article discusses the struggles to confront the historical Latin American construction of “motherhood”, as well as the adjustment process in the exercise of migrants mothers’ roles, at the material and symbolic levels. Considering the context of general physical absence of the father and construction of motherhood ideas of sacrifice, the adjustment of traditional meanings, the relations with those who support them, and the construction of transnational “migrant others” (whose attitudes do not conform to traditional motherhood images) are relevant findings. The author studied at the Institute of LA Studies in the Free University of Berlin, and has collaborated with the University Alberto Hurtado, in Santiago, Chile.


Through a demographic analysis based on the South Africa national census of 2001 and the Agincourt health and demographic surveillance system, this article studies the settlement patterns of migration, challenging the hypothesis that relates rapid urbanization with massive permanent migration. Findings about human settlement patterns would indicate a relatively embedded temporary circular rural-urban migration; as well as step migration starting from villages to nearby towns and afterwards to secondary urban areas; these regions get the largest net gains of population increase. However reverse movements from urban areas are also significant and would be caused by the decreasing standards of living in urban slums. People from rural areas tend to go back, especially when they become ill. The author concludes that future policies should take into account these implications of the complex
relations between urbanization and migration. Based on these findings, health and social policies implications are discussed.

The three authors are researchers at the University of the Witwatersrand, South Africa.


This study attempts to incorporate and make explicit xenophobia in the debates about migration and development by examining the growth of this phenomenon in host countries in the South. It offers brief descriptions of xenophobia in five countries including South Africa, India, Malaysia, Libya, and Thailand; discusses the ambiguity the xenophobia concept, highlighting its crucial features and possible study methods. Xenophobia is found to be a generalized problem that accompanies large-scale migration, in both its legal and irregular manifestations.

The author uses gaps in existing empirical work, research and anecdotal evidence to show pervasive forms of discrimination, hostility, and violence experienced by migrant communities in host countries. They briefly review the applicability of the xenophobia conceptualization developed from a Northern perspective to countries of the south. Xenophobia has been related to contact, crime, asylum-seekers; nation-building and nationalism, the related rise of the extreme right, alleged cultural differences, and real competition over limited resources; and perceived rather than real economic threats. By giving a wide range of examples from diverse contexts, the paper explores possible reasons for the intensification of xenophobia, arguing that although xenophobic tendencies can be treated as contextual factors, they respond to broader changes in political, social, and economic structures: political and economic integration of countries; the securitization’ of migration after 9/11; structural transformation of industrial societies and consequent increasing exclusion and marginalization of former class identities; and racialized and nationalist media representations. The authors conclude that continued discriminatory treatment of migrant groups can contribute, in the long-term, to the emergence of a new social underclass, but above all, that xenophobia heightens social insecurity experiences by migrant populations, and by other minority and marginalized groups as well. On these bases, the final section examines policy options to tackle it, outlining bad and good practices in state policies and their effects to counter xenophobia, in Northern and Southern states. The authors claim that a coordinated global response is needed, as well as subscription to global and regional normative standards. Research needs identified are greater monitoring, measurement and research on citizen attitudes to migrants, refugees and migration policy, particularly in the South, seeking outcomes such as evidence-based public education and media strategies.

Crush is Director of the Southern African Migration Project (SAMP) and Southern African Research Centre at Queen’s University, South Africa. http://www.cigionline.org/person/jonathan-crush

Ramachandran is research associate at the Southern African Migration Project (SAMP).


This paper uses data of bilateral (in country of origin and destination) migrant stocks for 127 countries to understand the relations between migration and development through an analysis that considers non-linear relations at a country level, based on income as indicator of country economic development. The authors find a robust non-linear inverted-U shape relationship between income at origin country and
emigration. Such relation would be weak to statistical controlling for (or if excluding the effect of) destination country income and variables assumed to reflect the economic, historical and cultural proximity between source and destination countries. Their findings also reject a causal relation from migration to country income (development) on either origin or destination income. The author’s interpretation is that migration is not relevant to increased development, but it is relevant terms of the expanded opportunities for individuals.


This chapter explores links between migration and poverty and their implications for social policy, focusing on migration by the poorest, SSM and child migrants. It argues that research on migration-poverty linkages should depart from poverty knowledge and context-dependency. Child migrants raise distinctive migration issues and social constructions raise gendered distinctions. The authors notice an overemphasis on movement as a cause of vulnerabilities at the expense of socioeconomic disadvantages. They argue that children’s development has ‘public goods’ characteristics, but there are no mechanisms to ensure their fair share in wealth from migration, and the brain drain debates fail to capture these issues. Social policy is inherently political, and this makes it a double-edged sword for migrants; it can protect and support them, but it may also define citizenship, producing forms of inclusion and inevitably exclusion. They think that research about the mechanisms through which social policy can enhance access and include migrants as citizens is a priority, and notice the emphasis on win-win situations to address equity and efficiency, which would need to be extended to the discussion on migrants.

Although it is not mentioned frequently, SSM and internal migration are treated as migration of the poor. The chapter argues that policy attention has focused in SNM, that poverty migration is less likely to be captured in surveys and census, and that treating migrants as a homogeneous category dismisses variations of context, of labor market and of migrants involved. Gender and generation in migration knowledge is little with respect to poor households, and to intra-household processes. Migration motivations would reflect opportunities; while betterment is relevant for skilled migration, rural-rural migration tends to be motivated by survival and seasonal opportunities, with cultural differences. Remittances and their use vary widely because the context of those who stay is the same that motivates migration. A ‘successful’ migration bias may hide remittance absences.

De Haan is the leader of the Program Supportive Inclusive Growth at the IDRC. Yaqub is a social policy specialist at the International Research Centre, UNICEF-IRC.


The chapter is a critical assessment of the impacts of remittances on sending contexts, grounded in a broad view of the migration-development relations that takes into account dimensions of social, economic and cultural changes in the global South. The chapter provides thoughts on specific features of SSM and the possible impacts of remittances in these contexts: 1) Greater share of remittances seems not to go to the poorest households or countries, but the very poor countries, as the very poor people
are highly dependent on remittances. 2) SSM or internal migration are likely to be less selective, and then the insurance dimension of remittances can be larger compared to SNM remittances because of less negative impacts on local inequalities; 3) SSM and internal migration are possibly associated to agricultural stagnation; 4) Empirical studies are generally skeptical of the macroeconomic effects of remittances with respect to development ‘take off’. 5) Irregular migration entails higher risks and lesser remittance flows; in the South migration tends to substitute for lack of social protection; and socioeconomic contexts tend to lack or to have weak social protection and rights enforcement, higher labor exploitation, and there have been massive expulsions of irregular migrants; thus, irregular migration situations may be worse. The author concludes that it is an illusion to think that remittances can trigger take-off national development in the absence of more general reform because of structural development constraints. Therefore, social policies aimed at redistributing wealth, increasing people’s livelihood security and providing basic public services, such as universal health care and education, as well as economic policies enhancing access of non-elite groups to insurance and credit markets, are likely to enhance the contribution that migrants and remittances can make to development. The author is Co-director of the International Migration Institute of the University of Oxford, and he has extensive publications in migration theory and migration and development. http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/about-us/people/hein-de-haas


The paper argues that a meaningful understanding of migration must analyze agency and structure, as human development approach does. He proposes to analyze migration in the light of constraints along a development continuum from low to high, in order to differentiate degrees of constraint faced by individuals. Furthermore, in the first part of the paper, he contends that migration impacts on country development should incorporate the agency-structure dialectics to avoid simplification, acknowledging the relations involved in migration as a livelihood strategy (where SNM migration generally yields greater security than internal or SSM migration), on one hand, and the relations between migration and capitalism and state building related processes, on the other. In this regard he argues that migrants can affect development but only to a limited extent and migrants should not be charged with the responsibility of development. Change in origin or destination countries is not pre-determined; and it is necessary to better distinguish and specify mobility-development reciprocal relations at different levels and in different dimensions. He criticizes immigration restrictions for their impact on migrant’s wellbeing and for reducing the potential of migration to reduce poverty and inequality. The author is Co-director of the International Migration Institute of the University of Oxford, and he has extensive publications in migration theory and migration and development. http://www.imi.ox.ac.uk/about-us/people/hein-de-haas


Based on post-structuralist theories about the tensions between racialization and national identities' conformation, the article discusses the processes of socio-economic incorporation and the forms of discrimination experienced by Haitians in the Dominican Republic. It argues that these forms of discrimination are the same that those experienced by Dominicans in Puerto Rico. By studying similarities and differences of these two groups of migrants, the author concludes that immigrants are
racialized as the black ‘other’ who threatens a presumed whiteness of the receiving societies. Because each of these countries continues to import labour force from peripheral societies, the nationalist racialized discourse is replicated to justify migrants’ deprivation and their exclusion from citizenship rights.

Duany is Professor of Anthropology at the University of Puerto Rico, Río Piedras.


This econometric analysis is based on the extension of the Database on Immigrants in OECD Countries (DIOC) to cover non-OECD receiving countries (extended version now called DIOC-E) until around 2000. Bilateral migrants’ data corresponds to 28 OECD and 61 non OECD destination countries around 2000, and 230 origin countries with respect to emigration. The paper uses detailed information about sex, age, educational attainment and labor force status. The author undertakes unilateral and bilateral econometric analysis on emigration rates for different skill levels in destination countries outside the OECD. This is an early and sophisticated econometric attempt to research distinctive bilateral determinants of SSM and SNM, which differences are estimated and presented. Dumont is a senior economist at the OECD Paris, and has done significant research work in international migration economic and development issues; Spielvogel is an economics professor and researcher in international migration, development economics and geography, and collaborator for OECD; Widmaier is also an OECD migration expert.


This is a critical review of policy literature on migration and development, addressing issues of internal and SSM in relation to brain drain. Based in Hirshman’s work, it provides interesting insights to inequality in migration studies. The book questions the assumption of the equalizing dynamics in migration-development neoclassical economic arguments. Ellerman suggests that only North-North migration involves such positive dynamics. His discussion of SNM/SSM and brain gain/drain seems to suggest that neither development at origin policies nor migration as a safe valve are developmental solutions, given that exit of the ‘best and brightest’ relieves the pressures for change, and reinforces the South/North divide (‘internally’ and internationally), as well as the ‘self image’ of getthoization in which only individual success is possible.

Ellerman is a visiting scholar at the University of California/Riverside and a Fellow of the Center on Global Justice at University of California/San Diego.


From a livelihoods perspective, this paper aims to contribute to the debates of migration-vulnerability and migration-poverty reduction in international and national migration. The paper treats SNM as migration from non industrialized to industrialized countries, and SSM as cross-border migration between low income countries. SSM movement to adjacent countries is separated from displacement due to ethnic conflict and war (refugees and asylum seekers); from movement to industrialised
countries (south-north migration); and from seasonal, circular, or longer duration sub-types in the preceding cross-border or international movements. The authors challenge sectoral thinking implicit in negative policy stances of rural-urban internal migrants as outmoded, and trace the same parallel for international migration. They argue that the key to rising farming productivity is urban and non-farm economic growth because of their roles in livelihoods security (and not in farm output growth); at the international level, the authors discuss the roles of diasporas and investment in local and country development, and the need to incorporate this relation in aid policies.

Ellis is part of the Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia, UK.


Based on the analysis of the affirmative action post-apartheid legislation (the Employment Equity, EE, and the Black Economic Empowerment, BEE), this paper discusses the contradictions and tensions in the definition of Chinese as a ‘previously disadvantage group’. The author analyzes the apartheid Immigrant Regulation Amendment Act (1953) with respect to Chinese’s inclusion, to dig out the arguments used by the Chinese Association of South Africa to challenge the courts’ decision to exclude them from this classification. Considering the historical ambiguity of government racial definitions, this article concludes that the Chinese case proves that the ‘policies of redress’ and of construction of inclusive notions of citizenship have not overcome the significance of race and racial classifications. One of the central issues for their failure to create a non-racial, cosmopolitan citizenship and belonging in a post-apartheid South Africa, is the distinction between South Africans of Chinese descent (immigrants and their children who received the South African citizenship before 1994), and those who recently arrived from China, Africa or the US, whom, according to the court ruling, cannot benefit from the EE or BEE policies.

Park is senior Researcher in the Centre for Sociological Research Humanities Research Village at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa.


The paper presents a statistical study of the effects of the 50 percent increase of immigrants in South Africa’s labor market in the post-Apartheid period, mainly from Africa, from a neoclassical economics framework. It finds a negative effect on the employment of native’s skilled migrants relative to non skilled, but not on total income of native’s active labor. However, it concludes that four different interpretations are possible, involving also emigration and changes in labor market.

The authors are related to the Centro Studi Luca d’Angliano. Mendola is also Professor at the University of Milan Bicocca.


This objective of the article is to determine the effects that xenophobic violence against migrants from Mozambique to South Africa have on their migration intentions. Based on sample data of households’ before and after the 2008 attacks, the authors design a regression model. From their findings, they argue that the sensitivity of migration intentions is higher when migrants have children younger than 15 years old and do not have social networks in their places of origin. The authors conclude that migrants are more concerned about their children’s future than of their own health and security.
Friebel is at the Goethe University Frankfurt; Gallego at the Universidad del Rosario, Colombia; and Mendola is at the University of Milan Bicocca.


From the perspective of migration management, the paper claims that OECD countries experience shows that immigrants’ integration ‘must be dealt with before the build-up to tensions makes it too difficult to manage’. It attempts to analyse SSM from a standpoint different to SNM particularly regarding multiculturalism models. Since borders are more porous and diversity is higher, integration policies should focus on the protection of migrants rights, fight discrimination and foster the ‘incorporation of immigrants’ into society. The paper argues that although immigrant integration is not a current priority for many policy makers, discrimination and the tendency of immigrants to live in makeshift communities have helped to breed divisions in society and generates economic and social costs. Migration is highly circular, labour activities are mostly informal and there is negligible difference in relative deprivation between locals and immigrants. The paper concludes proposing a framework to formulate coherent policies to enhance social cohesion ‘while dealing with immigration’ in the South.

Gagnon works at the Global Development Unit - OECD Development Centre. Khoudour-Castéras is at the OECD Development Centre.


Based on an ethnographic study of the context in which “informal social protection” operates in Bangladesh, the authors argue that this kind of protection is not the result of economic opportunities created by the boom in overseas migration. To explain particularities of informal social protection, the paper analyses the social relations between in-comers, colony residents, permanent and temporary workers, itinerant, seasonal in-migrants and overseas migrants in the local context of land tenure, markets and work opportunities in Jalalgaon village, Sylhet (a village of migrants to the UK), which has high levels of internal and overseas migration. The paper focuses in the interplay between international and internal migration, by tracking ‘closeness’ or ‘separation’ in the support by the rich emigrants to the UK to the local poor. The authors argue that support operates at two levels: the relatedness with the wealthy patron, and second, the distance to the internal-migrants' places of origin. Thus, although geographic movement is important, access to protection depends on access to hierarchically ordered places or on the way in which social relations are established.

Gardner is at Sussex Centre for Migration Research, International Development; Ahmen is at the University of Jahangirnagar University, Bangladesh.


From a post-structuralist perspective, the article uses multi-sited Philippine migration ethnography to discuss contradictions involved in the global commoditization of domestic workers, and its negative class consequences in terms of processes of subjective individuation and consumption. It takes a critical stance on ethnographic inclinations to ‘victimize’ migrants, by stressing Philippine migrant’s contributions to the perpetuation of labour migration. The author is at Dalhousie University, Canada.

This is a concluding chapter of a book containing nineteen case studies of transnational and intranational migration and mobility. The authors contrasts the nation-state centered policy regimes in which movement is seen as exceptional, including normatively, with the centrality of movement in processes of socio-economic change and evolution, as promoted under capitalist systems of economic organization. The arrangements resulting from current hybridization of market capitalist and nation state principles, for example in policy regimes for temporary migrants, mirror the indentured labour regimes of earlier eras. The authors support the use of frameworks that allow for both, understanding and evaluation, in particular a human security perspective enriched with a gender perspective. They discus the systems of the nation-state, market capitalism and gender power that structure the experiences of migrant women workers and suggest directions for possible re-cognition, to reduce and counter the invisibility and mis-framing of migrants. The chapter concludes by suggesting research areas and networking between researchers, policy practitioners and migrant advocates from the South and the North.


In an attempt to fill the gaps in SSM studies, this article discusses concerns of policy makers’ in destination countries. As in SNM, such worries are related to the impact of increasing supply of low-skill workers on a possible decrease in earnings of Costa Rica’s workers, increasing inequality, and poverty. Based on a quantitative model designed with yearly data of the Household Survey for Multiple Purposes, the study concludes that there is not enough empirical evidence to support the hypotheses of negative impacts of immigrants on Costa Rica’s labour markets. In the case of male immigrants, the less educated would have lower wages than the local population; however, it is argued that this trend does not mean that Costa Rican workers’ wages fell down as a consequence. In contrast, the presence of Nicaraguan female immigrants would have a positive impact on Costa Rican women’s salaries.

Gindling is researcher at the University of Maryland Baltimore County, Baltimore.


From a Fouculdian perspective of stratified reproduction on the basis of citizenship hierarchies, this article explores how women immigrants from Nicaragua to Costa Rica accept contraceptive methods such as quirurgical tubal ligations, and the contradictions generated in women migrants’ sense of belonging and social exclusion. The research site is an area with high levels of demand for flexible labor, where Nicaraguans occupy the places left by Costa Rican emigrants. In this SSM dynamic, the Costa Rican citizenship model based in jus solei enters in tension with national uniqueness notions related to low birth rates and being modern, self-disciplined and having a morality of higher stand. This study shows how the health system has become the ‘site for struggle over inclusion’ for Nicaraguan women and their Costa Rican-born children.

Goldade is at the University of Minnesota in the Medical School Program in Health Disparities Research.

In an attempt to study new SSM dynamics, this article explores the situation of Nigerian migrants who successfully left their country, but ended up trapped in China, a country that was not the intended destination. This phenomenon is in part a result of the restrictive immigration regime in developed countries. However, in order to explain its own dynamics, the author argues that this ‘second state of immobility’ is related to the connections between the circumstances of emigration and the immobility at the destination point. In Nigeria, lack of information about China as a destination point, and widespread brokering of Chinese visas, have contributed to the commercialization of the migration process. China, as an emerging destination for intercontinental migration, does not have the legal mechanisms to respond to high immigration pressures, and thus the government has opted for increased policing of foreigners within national borders.

Haugen, is at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo, Norway.

41. Hong, Liu (2005) ‘New Migrants and the Revival of Overseas Chinese Nationalism’ Journal of Contemporary China. 14(43). (EBSCO) Through the analysis of the Chinese state policy toward the new Chinese migrants (student-turned-migrants; emerging professionals; chain migrants, and illegal migrants), this article discusses the revival of overseas Chinese nationalism. According to the author, new waves of migration to the more industrialized countries in the West, mainly to North America, Europe and Oceania at the expense of Asia, have created a sense of identification in Chinese migrant communities. In the context of the consolidation of modern Asian immigrant states, the Chinese political discourse of nationalism has changed in two senses. On the one hand, return is not anymore a prerequisite of patriotism; the cultural message is that serving China’s economic development means taking back to the homeland technology and knowledge; for illegal migrants, sending remittances for family use is also a manifestation of patriotism. This cultural message has been reinforced by the presence of the Overseas Chinese Affairs Office in destination countries. On the other hand, China government’s policy towards Taiwan has become a cultural symbol for Chinese nationalism. However, the author concludes that the heterogeneity of the Chinese diaspora, the confrontations of Chinese nationalism in the international arena, and other contradictions at the transnational level, prevent the emergence of a unified nationalist ideology or movement overseas.

Liu is Chair of Chinese Studies, and Director of Centre for Chinese Studies and Confucius Institute at University of Manchester, UK.


This article is an in depth theoretical discussion on the relations between racialization, violence and power, contextualized in the Dominican Republic. It argues that the state’s historical, recurrent and ongoing role in the maintenance and reproduction of racialized violence and abuse against Haitians and presumed Haitian Dominicans, extends H. Arendt’s work in which violence attempts to substitute power. It shows the impact of racialized institutional violence in the legitimating of social violence, and in the context of racialized identities and spatial proximity. Howard illustrates the currency of his arguments with a public seminar on economic development, which allegedly turned into full verbalization of a hidden racist discourse (development as economic development).

Howard is researcher on Development at the University of Newcastle upon Tyne, UK.

This is one of the first publications on SSM and it laid the basis for the 2010 book on SSM and implications for social policy. The article is a brief review of questions relevant to research about migration and social policy: 1) Whether attraction of migrants from low-income countries by middle-income countries SSM migration can play a role in development. 2) The significance of remittances and social development in a context dominated by contract temporal labor, low or medium skills. 3) The limited applicability of the concepts of *brain drain* and *transnationalism* to the extent that they refer to a small elite migrating through long distances and with greater chances of permanence. 4) The applicability of the *global care chains* concept and its implications for the reproduction role of social policy. 5) The political dimensions of civil society activism and trade unions.

Hujo is Research Coordinator of the Social Policy and Development Programme at the UN-RISD and former research fellow at the Latin American Institute at Free University Berlin. <http://www.unrisd.org/unrisd/website/people.nsf/(httpPeople)/2A88D5BDF70D41CFC125712C003E65C5?OpenDocument>

Piper is researcher at the University of Sydney; she specializes in the governance of migration and has significant work in gender and migration in Asia and Latin America. <http://sydney.edu.au/arts/sociology_social_policy/staff/profiles/nicola_piper.shtml>


This introductory chapter attempts to analytically integrate the discussions on SSM on one hand, and social policy on the other, to the relations between migration and development. A central claim is that without a socially enabling environment organized by a social policy regime, migration is unlikely to contribute to development. The book has six chapters on SSM and social policy in the areas of remittances, poverty, brain drain, social protection, gender and care, and political organization. The view about SSM provides four hypothesis on its distinctiveness: geographic proximity as a factor attracting poorer and less education migrants, where no contiguous borders exist; the attraction of skilled and non skilled migrant labour in SSM poles; the irrelevance of remittances to macro-economic variables in the South; and the limited capacities of South governments to offer decent work and social protection. At a regional level economic variations would explain the higher rates of migration among higher and middle income South countries, particularly lower migration costs. Similarly environmental change and political conflict play important roles in some regions, which are revised generally. The South would be a regional context for local patterns of circular, temporary and or seasonal migration, and education and marriage. Globally, gendered demand structures and demographic change would underline migration patterns visible at the regional level, of which an overview is given. Thus, migration in the South would be a dynamic process shaped by local, regional and global forces, where the limits between internal and international migration are sometimes blurred, and where economic regional integration has meant an incipient shift towards less restrictive migration policies. The analytical integration of SSM and social policy departs from gendered migration as a substitute for welfare arrangements (demand for care workers, also in the North) and simultaneously migration as a
livelihood strategy in their absence. The effects of migration on economic development are transmitted through labour markets (care economy), monetary transfers (remittances) and their impacts over economic development at a macro and meso levels (productivity, macroeconomic stabilization and social conflict). The relation between gendered migration and social policy has a redistributive and equity dimension (domestic un/paid work) at the household level, and in social reproduction at a macro level in the care economy, between countries and between the North and the South. Migration supports social reproduction but creates new vulnerabilities. Where migration is a livelihood strategy (and sometimes a status achievement strategy), migration substitutes the functions of social policy. In the South, weak economic contexts would become push migration factors. In general migration policies and social policies are insufficient, while the presence of public debates about access to social services and insurance entitlements of migrants are scarce and problematic, compared to the North debates.

Piper is researcher at the University of Sydney, focusing on CSOs influence on the governance of migration, and has significant work in gender and migration, especially in Asia. [http://sydney.edu.au/arts/sociology_social_policy/staff/profiles/nicola_piper.shtml](http://sydney.edu.au/arts/sociology_social_policy/staff/profiles/nicola_piper.shtml)


Challenging media arguments about Chinese migration to South Africa as a state project, this paper discusses the way in which bilateral relations between these two countries during the processes of economic liberalization, and their inter-relations in the ‘global-south’, have opened new spaces for migration. In these spaces, Chinese migrants seeking to improve their personal quality of life create their own subjectivities, negotiate their identities and contribute to the reconstruction of identities of places. To explain these processes of migration, the paper also studies intra-Chinese relations across the complex diversity of Chinese new immigrants, including those who already have the South African citizenship, and the “late-comers” from different provinces in China. This critical review of transnational migration theory, points out that the sending and receiving countries should be analyzed as related sites in a multi-level way.

Huynh is at the Jinan University in the School of International Studies & Academy of Overseas Chinese Studies; Park is at the Rhodes University in the Department of Sociology; Ying Chen is Research Associate at SAIIA and at the Centre for Sociological Research at the University of Johannesburg.


The chapter offers a discussion of the dominant understandings of Indonesian migrant domestic workers to unpack disfunctionalities in the actual operation of national bound legal and institutional frameworks governing transnational processes. In the light of migrants’ lived experiences, the deficits of labor rights and migrant protection are analyzed in detail, in local sending and destination contexts. Irianto is researcher at the University of Indonesia and has extensive experience in legal anthropology and gender. Truong is associate professor at ISS, Erasmus University Rotterdam, and has extensive work in
gender, international migration and human security.

http://www.iss.nl/iss_faculty/profiel_metis/1100479/


From a migration systems perspective, this article explains how flows of Turkish citizens have become part of various migratory systems. The analysis is done at the micro, meso and macro levels, through the study of networks operations in various countries. The research focuses on project-tied migrant workers in the construction industry in Moscow. It concludes that, by virtue of Turkish foreign policy, during the post-Soviet period the internationalization of Turkish migrants broadened and was reorganized by destinations according to migrants’ profiles. Short-term labour migrants, shuttle traders and particularly project-tied migrants appear to play a role in the shift towards a market-based economy in the Russian Federation, and have become crucial actors of the migration system between Turkey and Russia.


This review of literature on gendered intra-regional Asian migration, from an approach to the study of unequal incorporation of women in the global division of labor, is based on an image of overlapping continuums involving end point categories in motivations, distances, policies-documentation status, and types of labour-economic activity, among other. The discussion is broadly divided in two sections. First, the macro-forces globally and regionally shaping migration trends, in a double ‘feminization’ of migration: that of growing labor markets and that of growing informal economy where women tend to be occupied and unprotected. Second, the discussion of micro-studies illustrates these trends, as well as the operation of exclusionary policies that promote irregular migration and leave migrant women socially unprotected and at the mercy of informal migration networks. The author concludes that irregular migration is at the core of the contradictions in liberal views of citizenship, and questions the sustainability of exclusionary policies, given their ineffectiveness and given the democratizing inclinations in several Asian countries.

Kabeer is based at SOAS, University of London, collaborating with major universities and cooperation agencies in the UK; she specializes in social exclusion and gender in relation to labour markets: http://www.soas.ac.uk/staff/staff59643.php


The chapter is based on the notion of ‘the care diamond’, to approach care regimes or the institutional and special care arrangements (spaces), which also reproduces existing social hierarchies. Conceptually, it involves overarching global processes and heterogeneous local arrangements involved in procuring care, passing through the spaces of the markets, states, communities and households. The chapter disentangles interactions across care regimes (for example the increasing coexistence of paid and
unpaid care work and contracts), exploring the implications of migration for gender relations and care provisioning in the countries of the South, while stressing the need of better specifications and moderation (for example, it questions whether the family continues to carry the burden of care to the same extent than in the past). On the other hand, the paper analyses the applicability of the global care chain concept and the ethics of care for migration in the South. Acknowledging the lack of recognition of the social and economic contributions of cheap care workforce, it argues that although remittances has meant to recognize their contributions, their own care or the unpaid care arrangements (often drawing on internal migrants) left behind are seen as less important; there is also a need to evaluate the contributions in countries of destination. Drawing on the ethics of care literature, it argues that the emotional and intrinsic qualities of care also need recognition; that they should not be seen as inherently feminine qualities; and should be extended to the social organization of production and reproduction globally.

Middle-income countries as poles of migration with active interventions and/or social policies for care provision; countries largely exporting care labour; and countries where care systems have been overwhelmed by the HIV/AIDS pandemic, are all mentioned as part of the South. The analysis of care arrangements needs to be attuned to local specificities which entail different histories of development policy, care arrangements and gender regimes. Heterogeneity questions the usefulness of the South as a single category but also helps to notice differences within both the North and the South. Care provision in countries of the South tends to be indirect; social policy is marked by care deficits formally (in the private, voluntary and public sector areas) or informally, and filled by women working outside the home nationally and internationally. The market continues to be a major provider. Modernizing notions of development have meant that, where care exists, it may be targeted to vulnerable groups seen as left out of development.

Kofman is Head of Research, Department of Social Sciences, and Co-Director of the Social Policy Research Centre at the Middlesex University, UK:
www.mdx.ac.uk/aboutus/staffdirectory/Eleonore_Kofman.asp

Raghuram is researcher at the Open University, UK; she specializes on mobility and knowledge production: http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/staff/people-profile.php?name=Parvati_Raghuram


This article undertakes a critical revision of issues related to the global care chain concept that have been developed on the basis of empirical evidence from the study of SNM. The authors question that the more heterogeneous health care regimes, migration regimes and gendered structures in the South may not be well explained in the idea of the transfer of costs downwards, particularly if heterogeneous familial situations and complex care arrangements are considered. The authors illustrate this possibility by showing the coexistence of diverse migration trajectories (internal, international and across occupations) present in the cases of Argentina and South Africa, and discuss their implications.

Kofman is Head of Research, Department of Social Sciences, and Co-Director of the Social Policy Research Centre at the Middlesex University, UK:
www.mdx.ac.uk/aboutus/staffdirectory/Eleonore_Kofman.asp

Raghuram is researcher at the Open University, UK; she specializes on mobility and knowledge production: http://www.open.ac.uk/socialsciences/staff/people-profile.php?name=Parvati_Raghuram

Based on an extensive, two year, multi-qualitative methods research, the article focuses on migrant’s agency by discussing the ways in which women Burmese migrants negotiate their daily, generational and biological reproduction as ‘factory workers’, at the border area between Myanmar and Thailand. Changing connections with home and the family are explained in detail, in the light of constraints on mobility, access to health and education, which are closely related to their ambiguous legal status, and corresponding administrative procedures. This reveals the Thai government’s contradictory objectives of industrialization and cheap labour hunt, versus a nationalist form of nation-building, and the transfer of resources from migrant women and families to sustain the social reproduction of labour.

Kusakabe is based at the Asian Institute of Technology at the Gender and Development Studies Program: http://www.serd.ait.ac.th/pages/peopleinfo.php?id=16

Pearson is at the Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Leeds: http://www.polis.leeds.ac.uk/about/staff/pearson/publications.php


Drawing on Latin American case studies of localities within Peru Bolivia and Mexico, the article discusses theoretical extensions to migration from feminist theory, focusing in intra-household power relations. The author shows the role of intra-household dynamics in the gendered migration decisions and access to employment in destinations. She also discusses the reworkings of gender divisions of labour, ideologies and identities. The cases focus on female domestic and industrial workers of rural origin. Attention is paid to rural-urban rather than cross border migration, except for the Mexico US case, but she recalls that other studies have shown similar dynamics.

The author is a Professor of Geography at the University of Washington, and has done significant work on gender, international migration, and migration within the USA: http://faculty.washington.edu/lawson/


Based on a migrant and families ethno survey and interviews in Costa Rica and in several villages in the District of Matagalpa in Nicaragua, the article questions the application of mainstream development theories to South-South migration, by showing the constraints faced by migrants and families left behind in undeveloped rural contexts. The author is trained in Environmental Science Policy and Management, Division of Society and Environment of the University of California Berkeley.


From a grassroots transnationalism approach, this article attempts to fill the gap in the study of African traders to China, as part of significant changes in African economies and societies, as well as their interactions in Chinese cities since the introduction of the ‘Open Door’ policy and the increase in bilateral trade, even during the financial crisis in 2008. The article analyses how the Guangzhou-Africa
trade has changed since 2005, the strategies adopted by Africans at the end of the value chain, and the changing perceptions of their own migration, their communities and their host city.

Lyons is at Urban Development and Policy in the Department for Social Studies, London South Bank University. Brown is at School of Town and Regional Planning, Cardiff University. Zhigang is Center for Urban and Regional Research, Sun Yet-sen University, Guangzhou, China.


This paper distinguishes three types of Chinese migration to Africa: a temporary labor migration linked to public building works and infrastructure projects undertaken by big Chinese enterprises; an entrepreneurial migration flow made up of merchants, some of whom would come from the other diaspora communities; and ‘proletarian’ transit migration to western countries, that would wait in Africa for opportunities to enter those countries. The discussion of migration is part of an argument about the foreign relations between China and Africa, with the China state purpose of expanding growth and political influence by gaining access to natural resources (oil and minerals) to increase Chinese exports.


Based on ethnographic research in the cities of Accra and Kakar, this paper analyses the growth of independent entrepreneurial migrants arriving from China since 2000. The author scrutinizes the empirical foundations of hostile discourses of African traders regarding an alleged encroachment of West African urban markets by Chinese petty entrepreneurs. The authors argue that the analysis of trade trajectories shows that Chinese products were reaching Africa before the arrival of independent Chinese migrants, and provide statistical evidence of their relatively minor role in the import of cheap goods to Ghana and Senegal, compared to the activities of other African and Chinese entrepreneurs to Senegal and Ghana. The authors find that recent transnational trading networks have been formed on the basis of membership in religious groups, and more generally social networks operating on the basis of trust, and function as knowledge channels about goods and consumers. The authors acknowledge that the competence fostered by Chinese presence has a structural impact on local traders’ profit margins. Local African traders have social obligations that limit their possibilities to reduce prices without affecting their living standards, while wholesale traders decrease the margins of profit to the minimum. The authors argue that Chinese small entrepreneurs’ position as ethnic minorities makes them vulnerable to the spread of negative rumors and anti-Chinese discourses, while local traders feel threatened by the reputation of industriousness of the Chinese ethnic migrants.

Marfaing is is a senior research fellow at the Institute of African Affairs of GIGA (German Institute of Global and Area Studies).

Thiel is research fellow at the GIGA Institute of African Affairs and a Ph.D. candidate in political science at the University of Aberdeen.

The article deals with the seasonal emigration of harvest laboring Haitians to Dominican Republic, from 1920-1986. This historical review argues that from the 1930s to the 1960s, recruitment and employment of Haitians changed from a system of relatively free wage labor to a government managed system of semi-coerced exploitation, which stands even within other Caribbean systems of labor control after slavery. Special attention is given to the role of USA interventions, the convergence of state formation processes, and tensions and collaboration between the two national governments to forcibly channel Haitian migrants to the sugar industry.

The author is an anthropologist based in the University of Connecticut, and his work deals with human rights and migration, particularly of Haitians in the Dominican Republic: anth.uconn.edu/faculty/samuelmartinez.php


The article categorizes five Southern countries according to gender categories in: patriarchal, matriarchal and in between these two categories. It attempts to draw a continuum across these three country gender categories and, on this basis, to assess emigration rates to the USA. The countries included are Mexico and Costa Rica (patriarchal), Nicaragua and Dominican Republic (matriarchal) and Puerto Rico (between the former two categories). Data is based on household ethno-survey compilations of the Mexican Migration Projec (MMP, 1982) and the extended Latin American Migration Project (LAMP, 1998). Although this is strictly South-North migration research and despite questions on the countries’ classification, it provides detailed information and forms of unions in 93 communities in Mexico, and 26 in the remaining countries, with thousands of households surveyed.

Massey is a well known researcher and theorist in international migration, based in the Office of Population Research of the University of Princeton: www.princeton.edu/sociology/faculty/massey

Capoferro is also based at the same institution.

Fischer is researcher in the Department of Sociology of the University of Connecticut, USA.


This article analyses ‘low end globlaisation’ of Africans in China, understood as the informal economic activities involving low amounts of capital and semilegal or illegal transactions that emerged towards the end of the 1990s among groups of traders traveling from African, the Middle Eastern and South Asian countries. The article distinguishes the upper class traders from African countries, from traders operating in Sanyuanli, Guangzhou, or in Hong Kong’s tourist district, full of wholesale businesses and cheap guesthouses (where African and other developing-world traders mix with Indian, Pakistani, and mainland Chinese merchants). Igbo and other West African traders and labourers in Guangzhou may be cheated by disappearing producers. Sometimes they choose to overstay their visas in order to carry on with their business, hiding from or bribing the police to know in advance in case of raids. If risks are too high, they may return to Africa, seek a romantic relation with socially marginalized women, search for support groups, or move to countries like Thailand, Vietnam and Malasya, in search for cheaper goods. The article focuses in the livelihoods of these traders, providing examples and insights of the different groups and their efforts to succeed in China. It argues that the role of this country in manufacturing cheap goods enable other developing regions to experience globalization, and contrasts these new
migrations to XIX and early XX centuries migration. The article provides a rich ethnographic portrait of African traders.

Mathews is at the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Yang Yang earned her M. Phil. in anthropology at the Chinese University of Hong Kong in 2011 and is assistant consultant for AECOM Technology Corporation in Hong Kong.

The research for this paper was funded by a Competitive Earmarked Research Grant (CERG), Research Grants Council, Hong Kong.


This article attempts to fill research gaps on the area of relations between development and migration of youth. The study uses micro-data from national censuses and large-scale household surveys to provide a detailed description of the lives and circumstances of young migrants from developing countries. Using available data for migration to developed and developing countries, the paper compares SSM to SNM patterns. Migrant is defined according to the place of birth; youth is defined broadly as the transition between childhood and adulthood but statistically located between 12 and 24 years old; flows are also counted as the people recently arrived, or less than two years for the majority of regions, and refers to the contemporary young; stocks, in contrast, are those who migrated when aged 12-24, whom are currently older. Countries are defined according to income, and six developed countries, four middle income (Argentina, Costa Rica, Mexico and South Africa), and two low income countries (Ivory Coast and Kenya) are included. The total number of migrants is 340,000 for youth stock and 60,000 for youth flows. The major missing data on migration flows are for migration from Central Asia to Russia, migration from South Asia to the Gulf states (partially complemented with a census from Oman), and migration to India from neighboring South Asian countries. Data on return migrants from household surveys in Albania, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, and South Africa are used to complement such caveats. As it occurs with gender, undercount of illegal migration means that the share of youth in migrants is higher than reported.

Young people aged 12-24 on average account for one-third of the flows and one-quarter of the stocks of international migrants. Among the relevant patterns, it is argued that the share of youth in the flows is greater for SSM than for SNM. The share of females among the flow of young international out-migrants averages 50 percent across all countries included. Youth independent of adult migration seems greater in SSM than SNM; youth female international migrants are found much more likely than young male migrants to be married and accompanying a spouse. A significant finding is that, except for the USA, all recently arrived female immigrants, regardless of development region/country and of age, show greater occupational concentration than male immigrants; this occupational concentration pattern is similar for younger youth flows. Furthermore, regardless the development level of destination, return tends to be at working age, peaking at 25-28 years in five of the 12 countries included (and implicitly questioning the brain drain arguments). The author suggests that countries targeting skilled migration (particularly developed countries) offer few opportunities for intended youth temporal migration. Second, the large majority of young SSM would be either at school or working, and the author claims that SSM may be beneficial to the development of human capital, based on high shares of immigrant youth aged 18 or more were attending school in Mexico and South Africa [and thus not necessarily in ‘least developed countries’]. However, in contrast to this trend, the author finds intriguing sizable numbers of older youth (18 or more), who are neither in school nor working in some countries. On this basis, he calls for qualitative research about the links between lack of integration, return migration, and the level of ‘disaffection’ among immigrant youth.
McKenzie is an economist based at the WB Development Research Group; he researches on econometric methods useful for working with data from developing countries, among other issues.


The article is part of a larger field research in localities of Cote d’Ivoir and Burkina Faso, mixing focus groups, individual interviews and ethnographic data, to investigate the living and working experiences of migrants, their families and second generation migrants to Burkina Faso. It questions the household as unit of analysis and proposes to attend personal relations instead; similarly, it rejects categorizations, the study of general attributes and the remittances assumption, on the grounds of the heterogeneity of his data. He proposes to investigate survival strategies to better understand interpersonal relations as unit of analysis. The author is a Ph.D. graduate on Sociology from the University of California.


The chapter discusses the findings of this book and other literature, mainly about US immigration. The authors draw parallels across different cases of gendered and non gendered migrant liminality and related situations of misrecognition; as well as their consequences in terms of rights and access to social services and social benefits. The authors identify research avenues surrounding legal orders, gender and migration.

Menjívar is a USA based sociologist; Bibler is an anthropologist focused on criminal and legal issues; both have done significant work in immigration to the USA.


This edition is the result of research collaboration of the MMN’s between 2009 and 2012. It includes overviews of: country and regional context; update on trends, legislations and issues relating to migration; and studies on border economic zones (BEZs) and migration. The book is divided in four parts: 1) Overview of country situations, including summaries of political, economic and social issues pertinent to migration and economic information about trade, foreign direct investment and official development aid. 2) Overview of migration with updates of migration-related policies and issues. 3) Overview of BEZs based on secondary research, including the establishment of BEZs, legal frameworks, and the roles of ODA and FDI in BEZs. 4) In-depth study on BEZs and Migration based on secondary and primary research, summarizing detailed information and outlining the impact of BEZs in Cambodia-Vietnam, Thailand-Burma/Myanmar, Thailand-Cambodia and Thailand-Laos. Each chapter describes antecedents, management structure, relevant agreements and policies, current situation and future plans, impact on migration flows and migrants, and working and living conditions, and impact on local people. Gender specific information is scarce.

The book concludes with recommendations regarding: participation of all stakeholders in the process of establishment of BEZs; protection of land rights; rights and welfare of migrants and workers (monitoring and improving working conditions and worker protections, labour organization rights, cross-border migration restrictions, urban planning); and sustainable development.

The paper is a revision of literature on international migration flows of human resources, providing insights and research gaps for SSM. It analyzes skills and gender in the current migration flows and policies, the impacts of skilled emigration on education and health, and the brain drain versus brain gain debates, identifying distinctive issues for SSM. The paper provides information on diaspora activity in Southern countries and gives policy recommendations to support their development roles.

Meyer is Director of Research at the IRD, France.


The objective of the chapter is to draw a comparison of the socio-demographic and migratory profiles of Congolese migrants across continents (Europe, America and Asia). Although it is not properly a South-South migration study, the focus on Congo as a migratory system provides relevant data on the characteristics of Congolese migrants within Africa (mainly men, young, single, relatively less educated or skilled, and migrating for economic reasons) and the relative lesser weight of their remittances, compared to those sent from other continents. Numbers represent migration towards the end 1980s and early 1990s. Based on an extensive ethno-survey in Kinshasa (995 households and 992 individual biographies), heavily involving migrant’s relatives as informants and thus likely to incur in errors, the author advises to take results into perspective.

The author collaborates with the International Immigration Institute of the University of Oxford, UK.


This paper funded by the Rockefeller Foundation is a preliminary assessment of the role and impact of growing ethnic Chinese business in Africa, under a concern that the scale and dynamism may shape future economic, social and political relations in the future. The paper attempts to focus in SSM in Africa, in contrast to previous research interest in SNM. The focus is on day to day linkage and ‘globalization from below’ that characterizes growing diaspora in Africa, estimated to be 35 million across 136 countries in the world. The questions leading this review focus in ‘what is’ and ‘what may become’ of these diasporas, regarding their economic sectoral activities and geographic locations; their social organization and trajectories; the role of the Chinese and African states, and how they are perceived by African citizens and consumers. For this purpose, the authors review historical studies of Chinese migration and recent unpublished works in the internet; ‘located’ web based news and reports; and send a questionnaire to key academic and policy informants. The review concludes that China’s presence has variable and context specific impacts depending upon the nature of the economic ties, the
size of the existing diaspora community, and the institutionalisation of government policies in China and the respective African countries. Since China is in Africa to stay, the report drafts a monitoring agenda of the unfolding of these relationships, stressing the need to undertake case studies that examine the same issues across countries.

Mohan is researcher on networks and the politics of development at the Open University, UK. Dinar is also researcher at the Open University, UK.


This is an update on the levels of migration remittances flows to developing countries. Officially recorded remittance flows to developing countries are estimated to have increased by 6 percent to $325 billion in 2010. This healthy recovery after the decline registered in 2009. The authors comment that the continuation of this slight improvement of remittances levels would depend on three risks: a fragile global economic recovery, volatile currency and commodity price movements, and anti-immigration sentiments in many countries. The brief claims that developing countries are becoming more aware of the financial potential of remittances and diaspora’s wealth potential.

Mohapatra is economist at the Development Prospects Group at the WB. Ratha is a Lead Economist and Manager of the Migration and Remittances Unit at the World Bank. Silwal is also at the WB.


This paper is an alternative study to research focusing in asymmetrical engagement of China’s involvement with Africa. The article studies the movements of Africans to Guangzhou, Macau and Hong Kong, and more generally the emergence of African communities in Southern China during the last decade. The paper first discusses the transformation of Macau from its former Portuguese influences, by analyzing the inflow of Nigerian students, business people or migrant workers since 2000. These communities contrast to former Portuguese colonies from Angola, Cape Verde, São Tomé and Príncipe, Guinea-Bissau, and Mozambique. The experiences of exclusion, indifference and ostracism experienced by these new communities, are contrasted with the official discourse of cultural diversity linked to tourism. The paper distinguishes between the inflow of Africans traveling for business on a regular basis; settler African traders, particularly Nigerians running local business, marrying Chinese women and establishing a web of formal and informal networks; and the new form of silent migration of Nigerians enrolled in higher education in Macau, with financial support independent of the Chinese government and taking advantage of opportunities offered by the Chinese local society to negotiate their integration. The paper stresses the absence of studies about these communities and their cultural manifestations.

From a pragmatic approach to the study of children and youth, this study focuses in Benin, Togo, Ghana and Nigeria, West Africa. Based on a multi-site ethno-survey, including classic and child specific (play-related) methods, it classifies the organization of mobilities in five forms (agricultural, environmental, professional, informal economy hubs, traditional) and nine causes related to social, economic and cultural pressures, as well as knowledge and individuation strategies. It stresses the early entry into mobility and its acceptance by children, its historical character, and the tactical behavior involved, given the constraining context. The chapter further questions the structuring views of development agencies working with children.

Ndao is researcher in West Africa. No other information was found.


This paper attempts to fill the research gap of new Chinese movements to Africa, by reviewing the few empirical studies on Chinese migrants in various African countries. The review is organized in the following sections: a historical description of Chinese migration to Africa; diversified current migration flows, patterns and trajectories; and types of migrants, settlement patterns, and relations with African host societies. Using the South Africa case, the author provides not conclusive thoughts about the temporality of these movements occupying in-between spaces amongst a majority of impoverished local Africans and a narrow elite, be they white or black. The author stresses the role of Africa policies towards China, state-to-state negotiations, and social, economic and political contexts in African nations. The conclusions remark that Western views about China, migration policies toward Chinese in particular, and media messages, have so far been negative and influenced the reception and treatment of Chinese. Although cultural, language and values differences are obstacles to Chinese integration, migrants in some countries have adapted to local contexts, the author questions whether Chinese migrants have reasons to make longer-term commitments in the continent.

The paper is done as part of the Chinese in Africa/Africans in China research working group of the South African Institute of International Affairs (SAIIA).

Park is senior Researcher in the Centre for Sociological Research at the University of Johannesburg, South Africa.


This is an extensive analysis of labor migration between two communities of Paraguari, Paraguay, and Buenos Aires, Argentina. The econometric analysis is based on an ethno-survey and interviews, to obtain longitudinal data on migrants’ characteristics, employment, and household resources and migration trajectories. The main finding is a positive selection of migrants with respect to skills and education. Other estimations show that countries’ income differentials and exchange rates in Argentina significantly and positively affect migration flows; household wealth and migrant networks are additional positive emigration factors. Findings are interpreted as a clear contrasting example of South-South migration, compared to South North migration involving Mexico-USA.

Parrado is at the University of Pensilvanya: http://sociology.sas.upenn.edu/sites/sociology.sas.upenn.edu/files/Parrado_1.pdf

Cerrutti is Professor of Sociology at the University of Buenos Aires.
The paper describes four versions of the widely used Bilateral Migration Stock Database of the University of Sussex for 226 countries and territories, discussing potential uses and whether it is possible to reconcile all the available information in a single and complete matrix of international bilateral migrant stocks. This database seems to be the best available. The paper also comments on differences across countries in the definition of a migrant (birth versus citizenship), the timing of national census reports, and the underreporting of undocumented (irregular) migration.
Parsons is researcher at the Development Research Centre on Globalization and Poverty.
Skeldon is researcher at the University of Sussex.
Walmsley is at the Center for Global Trade Analysis, Purdue University.
Winters is at the University of Sussex.

<http://library.sau.edu/jpollitz/LatAm/immigration.pdf>
The article is based on a Report by the UN Latin American and Caribbean Demographic Centre (CELADE in Spanish), as part of the IMILA project on international migration research in Latin America. It offers a brief outlook of general migration trends within Latin America and the Caribbean, attempting to distinguish intra-regional trends from US bound migration. Contextualized in long term regional changes, the general characterization is one of coupling of demographic and economic factors (urbanization and industrialization), as well as political violence. A general picture of main cross-border migrations from the 1970s, 1980s and 1990s national census is offered, where rural-urban migration is involved.
Pellegrino is at the Programa de Población, Facultad de Ciencias Sociales, Universidad de la República (Population Program of the Faculty of Social Sciences, University of the Republic, Uruguay) and specializes in South American international migration.

The purpose of the study is to estimate the stock of current labour-migration dynamics in the region since 2005. Countries member of the Colombo Process are India, China, Bangladesh, Pakistan and the Philippines, Afghanistan, Viet Nam, Sri Lanka, Thailand, Nepal. The data and information come primarily from 11 country assessments of IOM field missions in each of the countries in 2010, which produced indicators related to currently dominant labor migration flows at three stages of the migration process: pre-migration, arrival at the destination country, and return and reintegration. Other research studies, official data and policy documents are also used. The data is not directly comparable but provides insights into trends across the region.
The majority of migrants are temporary labour migrants in the Middle East, especially the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) involving Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia and the UAE. Flows to other Asian countries include Malaysia, Singapore, Hong Kong SAR, Taiwan Province of China and the Republic of Korea. An overwhelming majority of labor migrants work on a temporary contractual basis. Many move without documentation and/or work in less-skilled and largely unprotected sectors of the
economy (construction, manufacturing and domestic work). Most Colombo countries experienced an increase in annual outflow for 2005-2009 (there is no information of Afghanistan or China). In 2005, the annual flow of migrants was around 2.7 million, in 2008 5.4 million. Decreases in 2009 labor migrant flows from Bangladesh, Indonesia, Pakistan, India and Viet Nam were due to the impact of the financial crisis. Women are moving more irregularly and have become a major source of foreign exchange in many countries; protection measures for women were introduced in India, Philippines and Sri Lanka. Migrants counted from Pakistan, Nepal (97%) and Bangladesh (95.4%) are almost exclusively male. From country assessments, 15% migrants from Thailand and 30% from Viet Nam are believed to be women, but official data do not represent the entire picture. Statistics on outflows are not always disaggregated by gender, including data from India, China and Afghanistan, and data would capture only those women who go abroad legally. Anecdotal evidence suggests that women are leaving through irregular channels. The study identifies good practices and challenges in current labour-migration management processes and policy options for improving migration management systems in the region. The role of policies and programmes in destination countries is not considered in detail because of time limitations and the study's parameters. The study highlights how information is disseminated, the recruitment process, welfare and support services in countries of origin and destination, and how labour migration's benefits are maximized. Rannveig is at IOM Bangkok; Aghazarm at IOM Geneva, and Battistella at Scalabrini Migration Center, Manila.


This multi-cited paper attempts a preliminary estimation of the numbers of migrants from and to developing countries; remittances received by developing countries; and a literature review in these themes. Original data comes from U. Sussex Global Trade Database, including 117 countries categorized as low and middle income countries, out of 169. The authors’ aim is to improve the data of bilateral migration and identify the particularities of SSM to explain the impact of remittances welfare on developing countries. The authors argue that migration can improve the matching of skills requirements of the countries involved. They find that the costs of South-south remittances are high due to bank fees, and to lack of competition in the remittances markets. The authors stress research needs in the areas of wages, irregular migration, migrant’s health, gendered trafficking, and instability of remittance flows. Based on the model of global general equilibrium, they conclude that SSM is more affected by economic cycles than SNM.


Ratha is a Lead Economist and Manager of the Migration and Remittances Unit at the World Bank; CEO of the "Migrating out of Poverty" research consortium.
Shaw is economist retired from World Bank’s Development Prospects Group.


Based on experiences of how social sciences (researchers) in Costa Rica have attempted to counter prevalent hostile representations about Nicaraguan migrants, this chapter discusses social science’s roles in policy making and social change, with reference to the political, institutional, and conceptual location of migration studies. It identifies the following possibilities, amongst others: shaping social imaginaries; translation of international into national laws; and participatory community interventions. Sandoval-García is based at the Institute for Social Research and the Media Studies School of the University of Costa Rica and specializes in migration and cultural studies.

The paper argues that although the China replicates policies of disadvantageous terms of trade, exploitation of natural resources, oppressive labor regimes and support for authoritarian rulers, Chinese involvement in Africa could still be different from that of the West since the Washington and Post-Washington Consensus. Two key elements would be foreign investment and infrastructure loans, on one hand, and aid and migration policies, on the other. According to the authors, these factors may be helpful to Africa’s development. The paper provides some trends and data of Chinese migrations to Africa since the 1960s, noticing a surge in flows since the mid 1990s. It also provides scattered data of movements of Africans to China, mainly related to aid and migration policies.
Barry Sautman is a political scientist and lawyer in the Division of Social Science, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.
Yan Hairong teaches in the Department of Applied Social Science, Hong Kong Polytechnic University.


Based on qualitative field work in five localities of South Sudan and Uganda the paper discusses whether current cross border migration is a result of historic inter-linkages, including cultural and ethnic similarities, pre and post colonial movements, bilateral refugee displacements, and bilateral relations between governments. The author draws interesting relations between refugee displacement precedent to labor and skilled migration, as well as informal trade. The conclusions are limited to ascertain the dynamic nature of linkages, but the author discusses the roles of individual agency, migrant communities, and also international and governmental agencies throughout the text.
The author is at the Department of Women and Gender Studies in Makerere University, Uganda.


This is an extensive study of the complexities and multi-dimensional aspects of illegal migration, particularly trafficking and smuggling of migrants from Bangladesh-India, India-Pakistan and Pakistan-The Gulf, particularly in the 1980s and 1990s. Bengalis (from former united Pakistan-India or from now Bangladesh) living in Pakistan are estimated to be a little over 2 million; and over one million Bengalis/
Bangladeshis are estimated to be living in Karachi illegally. Short field research in Bengali settlements and Indian slums is strengthened from interviews with experts and members from governmental and CSO agencies in both countries. On the basis of: internationally contextualized illegal flows between Bangladesh and Pakistan, with Pakistan as transit country to the Gulf rather than as destination; the experiences of these two countries as sending and transit migration areas, and denials of trafficking and smuggling, including Pakistan’s failed efforts to register foreign undocumented migrants; the author argues for the need to adopt a regional approach to migration, and for the need of the governments of Bangladesh and Pakistan to seriously consider granting dual citizenship.

The author is researcher at the University of Karachi, and works in refugee, migration and peace international relations.


This book introduction maps the conceptual basis and objectives underlying its contents; although it is not explicit, fourteen of the book’s chapters involve SSM cases. To some extent, the analyses parallel recent SSM work concerned with social protection, gender and generation in the South, and it is particularly aware of the relevance of cognitive frameworks and ethical implications to the achievement of social justice for transnational migrants. The book examines the links between gender and migration and their implications for social justice thinking, at the experiential and normative levels. For this purpose, the chapter reflects on the utility of a notion of human security driven by a concern for human vulnerability, as a framework for attention to social justice concerns. Conceptually, the book draws largely on governmentality practices as current forms of migrants’ control, which makes the case for the need to challenge dominant forms of apparently neutral knowledge and to reveal hierarchies of power-to-interpret that undermine world justice. The consequences of administrative categories that standardize migrants’ identities are relevant in this respect; such categorizations have produced spaces of legal ambiguity that have significant consequences for migrants’ ability to make choices in the present and of their life chances in the future. Enforcement of formal international commitments requires interrogating these categories and understanding power relations implicated in their applications through the perspectives of the migrants themselves. The authors stress the necessity to bridge the discrepancy between the normative and the lived realities in order to reveal how the misframing of categories of ‘security’, ‘gender’, and ‘migration’ obscures the role of unequal political, economic and social structures in determining migratory processes historically.

Gasper is at the ISS-EUR, and specializes in human security, the ethics of development and discourse analysis. http://www.iss.nl/iss_faculty/profiel_metis/1100439/

Truong is at ISS-EUR, and has done extensive work in gender, international migration and human security. http://www.iss.nl/iss_faculty/profiel_metis/1100479/


On the basis of multi-sited qualitative methodologies to research migrant Filipina domestic workers in Hong Kong, Singapore and Qatar, the chapter shows how context dependent structural vulnerability is
critically conditioned by the intersection of health systems and the organization of the migration regime. Heterogeneity in access to Reproductive Health Services and in health seeking behavior is explained by the articulation of discrimination in the discourses about sexuality and their migrant condition; and by the ideational and material dimensions of rights, work relations, and their contact with migrant associations.

Truong is at ISS-EUR, and has done extensive work in gender, international migration and human security. http://www.iss.nl/iss_faculty/profiel_metis/1100479/

Marin and Quesada Bondad work at Action for Health Initiatives (ACHIEVE), Inc., a Philippines-based organization working on migration, gender, and health issues.


Using qualitative life histories of Tswana women from 1996-1997, the article analyses the cultural intersections of female and male identity construction and the relations between migration and social reproduction. The author holds that there is a care crisis as a result of the HIV/AIDS pandemic, which involves the undermining of the fostering system (reciprocal care relations) and ultimately has increased the economic and care burdens of non migrant women. The article concludes questioning the cultural relevance of the ABC campaign to prevent further spread of the disease, given the neglect of cultural and social traces by the governmental and international agencies’ interventions.

The author is a researcher in social aspects of gender and health, particularly HIV/AIDS.


This is a reconstruction of the processes surrounding the immigration policy reform in South Africa after the Apartheid Regime (1990-2006). It draws largely from a policy actors-interests approach. Departing from a discussion of the two gate system, the article argues that the South Africa state showed remarkable capacity to deal with the inherited migration system, considering its contradictory Pan-African and market oriented stances. A central argument is that the slow change in the policy stance of, and tensions within the ruling party are explained by a context of growing xenophobia and a changing migratory situation; bureaucratic resistances hardening immigration control, the granting of citizenship and access to basic services, are argued as the major implementation and reform obstacle.

The authors are researchers for the French Institute of South Africa and the Forced Migration Studies Programme, University of the Witwatersrand.


The objective of the paper is to review trends in international labor mobility between 1990 and 2010, and to identify policy and institutional to optimize migration of labour for the welfare of the global economy. The author identifies current barriers to mobility: the principle of state sovereignty over immigration; the policies bias against admission of low-skilled workers; the post 9/11 security concerns and ‘crimmigration’; visa regimes in destination countries; limited recognition of qualifications; and limited portability of social security entitlements. He provides brief statements of the issues that a
global governance regime should address: innovative programmes for migration of low and high skilled workers; minimizing irregular migration including smuggling and trafficking of persons; regulation of the recruitment industry and ethical recruitment practices; involving concerned stakeholders in policies; protecting workers from abuse and exploitation; respect for international instruments on migrant worker rights; promotion of international, regional and bilateral cooperation in labour migration; facilitation of mobility and circulation of labour to meet identified labour shortages; addressing brain drain issues from poor developing countries; and promoting international, regional and bilateral cooperation in labour migration.

Wickramasekara is former Senior Migration Specialist at ILO.

REPORTS

85. GCIM (2005) Migration in an Interconnected World: New Directions for Action. Report of the GCIM. Switzerland: The Global Commission on International Migration. <[Accessed 22 April 2013 http://www.queensu.ca/samp/migrationresources/reports/gcim-complete-report-2005.pdf]> The report contains some comments on migration to the industrialized North and migration between developing countries. From a positive view of the relations between migration and development, the report focuses in migration within developing countries and from developing to industrialized countries. It discusses economic, social and human rights international migration issues, such as irregular migration, migrants’ integration, governance and human rights. A central argument is the general failure of national governments to capitalize on international migration and successfully meet its challenges. It proposes a set of principles of action to guide national, regional and international policies in order to address this failure.


border labour mobility as part of national development strategies. The chapters focus on structural determinants of labour mobility, on cross-cutting labour mobility, and on different countries and sub-regions. Among the specific recommendations in the document are: the protection of migrants and contractual foreign workers based on the Human Rights conventions and the Arab Charter of Human Rights; reform of the sponsorship system-Kafeel system; the liberalization and simplification of regular channels for low-skill workers’ mobility; integration of mobility in national development strategies; enhancing the fluxes of remittances, investment and circulation of financial, human and social capital through temporary, cyclical mobility; assisting the return of migrants in countries of origin and destination taking into account the impact on families; investing in education; and creating a regional dialogue aiming for appropriate bilateral and multilateral mechanisms for the mobility of Arab workers.

As a collection of articles, it provides interesting views across migration systems convergent in the Arab world, for example between oil exporting and oil importing countries of North Africa, the Gulf and/or the Middle East. The topics of the chapters have varied research issues, including youth or unemployment. The article about Lebanon illustrates the confluences that different migration systems can have in a single country.


The annual report is dedicated to the institutional capacities of nation states and institutions to adapt to international migration challenges and achieve a good migration management, in six priority areas for intervention. With respect to SSM, it makes a general reference about its increased importance in new destination regions. As every year, the report gives a (2010) general review of international migration trends and regional migration and development issues. It also includes a chapter on the impacts of the economic crisis on international migration. It concludes with policy recommendations, mainly for building national governments capacities in the area of international migration.


This is a Draft Report to the Secretary General, with a SSM section titled: ‘II. Recent developments on migration and development.’ It contains estimations of SS and SN migrant stock, updated for 2010. Although it is not a report to quote, it helps to clarify some SSM estimations provided in the by UNDESA Population Division (2012), which in 23 of April 2013 is the only UN official release of 2010 non projected estimations. Estimating the origin of international migrants stock is here qualified as ‘a major challenge’.


This is a summary of recent international migrants’ stock that emphasizes SSM. This brief is less technical and more illustrative than former UN-DESA-PD reports. It is organized in ten statements briefly explained and illustrated with tables, graphs and numbers. It is possible that this brief dated in June has temporarily substituted for former UN-DESA-PD Trends in International Migrant Stock reports (see
UNDESA 2011a and UNDESA 2009 below). The same report for 2012 (number POP/DB/MIG/Stock/Rev.2012) is here mentioned as forthcoming (footnote 1) but not available online. It is not clear if the 2010 estimates are projected (as in previous reports) or updated with 2010 data.


This report provides international, regional and national migration levels, trends and international legal instruments. Migration estimations are based on the *UN Global Migration Database*, and taken from other UNDESA reports (included below). The database contains the set of statistics on international migrants enumerated and classified by: country of birth or (in its absence) country of citizenship, sex and age. The Report includes some estimations for refugees, remittances (with information from the WB) and population projections to 2050 with and without migration. Relevant to SSM, are the world migration profiles tables. The world profile is also disaggregated in four development categories of countries: more developed regions; less developed regions; least developed regions; and less developed regions excluding least developed regions.


The report estimates the number of international migrants by sex and age (age cohort adjusted/standardized, or estimated if unavailable) for the first time. The first part provides the main findings; the second part describes the dataset and gives methodological explanations. The report contains time series of estimates and projections of the number of international migrants in 196 countries or areas with at least one hundred thousand inhabitants, for the years 1990, 2000, and 2010. Six major geographical areas (Africa; Asia; Europe; Latin America and the Caribbean; Northern America; and Oceania) are further divided into 22 geographical regions. Countries are divided in four development categories (adding one to the previous report): 1) More developed regions. 2) Less developed regions. 3) Least developed regions, as defined by the Committee for Development Policy (CDP), and which currently comprises 48 countries (Maldives, included in the previous, 2008 revised Report, has been excluded from this category this year). 4) Less developed regions, excluding least developed regions. The dataset is obtained from *Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2008 Revision* (United Nations database, POP/DB/MIG/Stock/Rev.2008).

Population census are the main source of statistics, complemented by population registers and nationally representative surveys (on the number, age and sex of international migrants). International migrants are equated with foreign citizens. The number of countries reporting census data dropped from 175 in 1990 to 150 in 2000. The refugee figures reported by the UNHCR and the UNWRA were added to the estimates of the international migrant stock for most developing countries hosting large refugee populations (which lack available or comparable statistics on refugee/’refugee-like’ situations); this is not the case for developed countries that include them in their census.

The Report was developed with support of UNICEF and the Special Unit of South-South Cooperation of the UNDP. Hania Zlotnik was the Director of UNDESA Population Division at the time of this report.


This report describes the contents of *Trends in International Migrant Stock: The 2008 Revision*, a
United Nations dataset distributed in CD-ROM. This dataset contains time-series of estimates of the number of international migrants for each mid-year (July 1st) that is a multiple of five over the period 1960-2010 (2010 numbers are extrapolated or projected from previous years). The first part provides the main findings. The second part explains the impact of the disintegration and reunification of countries (USSR in 1991, former Yugoslavia from 1992-2006, and Czechoslovakia in 1993); it describes the dataset and gives methodological explanations.

The initial building of the Global Migration Database had inputs from the Statistics Division of the Department of Economic and Social Affairs of the United Nations Secretariat, the Population Division of ECLAC, the World Bank, the University of Sussex and the Minnesota Population Center (IPUMS-International). The database contains a set of official statistics on the foreign-born or the foreign population enumerated in the countries or areas of the world and classified by origin, sex and age. Population censuses are the main source of statistics; in some cases, the data are derived from nationally representative surveys.

The workbook contains a set of tables for 230 countries for 1990-2010, and a separate set of tables for 2012 countries for 1960-2010. The 1960-2010 dataset follows the geographical borders before the 1990s reconfiguration; in order to keep comparability, it adds up migrants of the 2008 Eastern European countries’ borders, to correspond to the former period. Countries are divided in three development categories:

1) More developed regions; all countries of Europe, Northern America, Australia/New Zealand and Japan. The term “developed countries” refers to countries in the more developed regions.
2) Less developed regions includes all regions of: Africa, Asia (excluding Japan); Latin America and the Caribbean; Melanesia, Micronesia and Polynesia.

The Report was developed with support of UNICEF and the Special Unit of South-South Cooperation of the UNDP. Hania Zlotnik was the Director of UNDESA Population Division at the time this report.


This yearly UNDP report was dedicated to human mobility, including internal and international. Although the report considers inaccurate referring to migration between developing and developed countries as SNM, it provides a rough estimation of SS and SN migration. Even if the report does not attempt to study SSM, it offers valuable thought and data for future SS/SN international migration research. Furthermore, the Human Development Index has already been used as a categorization on its own for this research interest. The report structure follows the typical of a standard international report: a framing chapter; the contents chapter (movement trends, implications for individual’s well being, impacts of migration, migration policies) and finishes with a set of recommendations.

This report, produced in the context of the recent establishment of the UN Global Commission on International Migration, examines the background and nature of increased international migration, and its related policies, impacts and cooperation challenges. The broad scope of the report covers, besides the frequent overview of international migration, an uncommon historical review of international migration in the XIX and early XX century. Only in this section it uses the term SSM to refer to XIX and early XX century international segmented patterns of movement of European flows to wealthier regions, and non European flows in regions of plantation economies, and relates this historical pattern to North-South inequality. The scope of the report is broader than more recent annual reports of international migration of international governmental agencies, including discussions of social dimensions of international migration; temporary migration in relation to trade and services; and international displacement.


The report does not refer to SSM. However, its information is relevant with respect to forced labor and gender issues, largely involving the South, with the North mainly as destination, but including also material on South-South movements. It reports patterns and flows of trafficking in persons in 132 countries, including victims, offenders and forms of exploitation. Chapter I presents an overview of the patterns and flows; Chapter II reviews trends in five international-regions of trafficking, and ten subregions; and Chapter III discusses the progress and challenges in the formalization and enforcement of the 2003 UN Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking. Data is disaggregated by gender and age and based in information purposefully collected from statistics or official records of national governments, IGOs and NGOs. The report advises not to interpret numbers of trafficking as representative of the level of crime or number of victims in countries. An early discussion of strength and weakness of data, sources, under/over estimations and bias is useful.

This second international Report is an outcome of the UN Global Plan of Action to Combat Trafficking in Persons, adopted by the General Assembly (2010).


This is a report about the processes, outcomes and problems of the migration of women from South Asia to the Gulf region. From a rights based approach, the report maps structural and procedural aspects of migration, and emphasizes women's agency and empowerment as desired outcomes and a policy objectives. Available data at macro and regional levels and information from micro-level qualitative studies are analyzed, in an attempt to provide systematic data and information on crucial dimensions of the migration process of women (including reliable data on the magnitude of migrants and their wages, earnings and remittances).

Considering the dominant sexual division of labour, the report gives details of vulnerabilities of low skilled women migrant workers, and discusses the roles of regulatory regimes in shaping the processes and outcomes of migration and individual choices, including the adoption of contradictory policies that simultaneously encompass restriction, protection and promotion of migration. The Gulf region has historical trade and movement connections with South Asia, which has emerged as the most important source of migrant labour, particularly female migrants, to the Gulf. Migration of women from South Asia would be lower than the international averages, but increasing over time.
Despite the common history of colonial domination and a history of labour mobility, the two regions have different economic growth and development experiences. Currently, almost half the population movement is believed to consist of women. Like in the XIX century, the majority of ‘female’ migrants would be single and exposed to similar vulnerabilities (physical, sexual and emotional abuses). The majority of female migrants is occupied in low skilled jobs (domestic workers and low-end service providers), and a relatively lower percentage of semi-skilled or skilled workers. Living and working conditions are entirely dependent on the personal relationship with the employer; workers are tied to their employers by the Kafala (sponsorship) system prevalent in the Gulf countries. Despite the conditions of vulnerability, increasing remittances would have contributed to reframe the development narratives at the macro level (e.g. in Sri Lanka and Nepal) and subtle but important changes would be occurring in the gender balance of power at the household and societal levels in the labour sending regions.

Conclusions focus on the importance and effectiveness of the collective voice for protecting migrant women (migrants’ associations). The importance of pre-departure programmes and their positive impact in reducing vulnerability and empowering women migrants are highlighted. The report predicts an increase in income and welfare for both the individual migrant and for the sending economy, as well as ‘enormous consequences’ from gender and power relations changes at the micro and macro levels.

The authors are faculty members at the V.V. Giri National Labour Institute, India.


Within the general mainstream economic approaches discussing positive development impacts on national economies, this reports is probably the first mentioning the role of remittances flows in developing countries. Although it is still focused in South-North remittances flows, it constituted the conceptual basis for the so far most influential research on SSM, also published by the WB in 2007.
10. ACRONYMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDP</td>
<td>Committee for Development Policy (UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCIM</td>
<td>Global Commission on International Migration (UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HD</td>
<td>Human Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDI</td>
<td>Human Development Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IOM</td>
<td>International Organization for Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHRLLS</td>
<td>Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States (UN)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDESA</td>
<td>United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td>United Nations Development Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children’s Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNRISD</td>
<td>United Nations Research Institute for Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNWRA</td>
<td>United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>World Bank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSM</td>
<td>South South Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNM</td>
<td>South North Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNM</td>
<td>North North Migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSM</td>
<td>North South Migration</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>